NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE

TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

PRESENTED BY
THE HARSTONE ESTATE

THE MEANING OF
MODERN LIFE

A Series of Addresses Selected and Approved by a Committee of Scholars headed by

ROSSITER JOHNSON, LL.D.

President People's University Extension Society

CHARLES E. LIPSCOMB

President National Alumni

CHARLES F. HORNE, PH.D.

College of the City of New York

ISSUED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

NATIONAL ALUMNI

NEW YORK

THE MEANING OF MODERN LIFE

AS SOUGHT FOR AND INTERPRETED IN A SERIES OF LECTURES AND ADDRESSES BY THE LEADERS OF MODERN THOUGHT AND MODERN ACTION :::

THIS SERIES HAS BEEN ARRANGED IN SEQUENCE, AND EDITED WITH FOREWORD, INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES BY

CHARLES F. HORNE, PH.D.
Professor in the College of the City of New York

ISSUED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE NATIONAL ALUMNI
UNION SQUARE NEW YORK

E168 .H78 v.2

Copyright 1907 by The National Alumni

CONTENTS OF VOLUME

LECTURE

I. THE OUTLOOK
The Trend of the Century
SETH LOW, LL.D.,
Former President of Columbia University.

II. THE DANGER
Problems To Be Met
THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL.D.,
President of the United States.

III. THE BELIEFS
Religion, Science, and Miracle
SIR OLIVER LODGE, LL.D.,
President University of Birmingham, England.

IV. THE SUCCESSES
Five American Contributions to Civilization
CHARLES W. ELIOT, LL.D.,
President of Harvard University.

V. THE BEGINNINGS
The Man of the Past
E. KAY ROBINSON.

VI. THE ORIGIN OF LIFE
Its Chemical Creation by Science
JOHN BUTLER BURKE, M.A.,
Cambridge University.

VII. THE BIRTH OF CONSCIENCE
Morality of Nature
PRINCE PETER ALEXIEVITCH KROPOTKIN.

VIII. THE SOUL IN BEASTS
Growth of Modern Idea of Animals
COUNTESS E. MARTINENGO CESARESCO.

CONTENTS

LECTURE

IX. THE FAILURE OF EVOLUTION
Evolution and Marriage
ALFRED R. WALLACE, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.

X. THE LATEST KNOWLEDGE
Scientific Investigation and Progress
IRA REMSEN, LL.D.,
President of Johns Hopkins University.

XI. OUR COUNTRY
The Making of the Nation
WOODROW WILSON, LL.D.,
President of Princeton University.

XII. PATRIOTISM AND POLITICS
The Duties of Good Citizenship
HIS EMINENCE JAMES, CARDINAL GIBBONS.

XIII. AMBITION
The Conditions of Success
MAX NORDAU, M.D.,
President of Congress of Zionists.

XIV. OUR PAST
The Lesson of the Past
MAURICE MAETERLINCK.

XV. ART
The What and the How in Art
WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS, A.M., L.H.D.

XVI. ART AND MORALITY
Their Essential Union for Culture
FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE, LL.D.,
Ex-President of L'Académie Française.

XVII. WOMAN
Marriage Customs and Their Moral Value
ELIZABETH DIACK,
WILLIAM S. LILLY, M.A., J.P.,
Secretary of the Catholic Society of Great Britain.

CONTENTS

LECTURE

XVIII. UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE
The Essential Equality of Man and Woman
FRANCES COBBE,
WILLIAM K. HILL.

XIX. SOCIETY
The Rôle of Women in Society
LADY MARY PONSONBY.

XX. THE CHILD
The Beginnings of the Mind
H. G. WELLS, B.Sc.

XXI. LIFE'S INTERCOURSE
Language as the Interpreter of Life
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, LL.D.,
President of the University of California.

XXII. THE BOY
His Preparation for Manhood
DANIEL COIT GILMAN, LL.D.,
Former President of Johns Hopkins University and of the Carnegie Institution.

XXIII. HOW TO THINK
EDWARD EVERETT HALE, LL.D.,
Chaplain of the United States Senate.

XXIV. THE GIRL
The Thing To Do
WHITELAW REID, LL.D.,
Chancellor of the University of the State of New York; Ambassador to England.

XXV. MANHOOD
Selection of One's Life-Work
E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, LL.D.,
President of the University of Nebraska.

XXVI. THE COLLEGE GRADUATE
The College Man in Business
CHARLES F. THWING, LL.D.,
President of Western Reserve University.

CONTENTS

LECTURE

XXVII. SPORT

The Mission of Sport and Outdoor Life

GROVER CLEVELAND, LL.D.,
Ex-President of the United States.

XXVIII. THE TOILERS

Labor Organizations in America

CARROLL D. WRIGHT, LL.D.,
President of Clark College; former Labor Commissioner of the United States.

XXIX. THE SOIL

Land and Its Ownership in the Past

ALFRED R. WALLACE, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.,
President of the Land Naturalization Society.

XXX. ANARCHISM

Thou Shalt Not Kill

COUNT LEO TOLSTOI.

XXXI. WAR

A Demonstration of Its Futility

DAVID STARR JORDAN, LL.D.,
President of Leland Stanford University;

CARL SCHURZ, LL.D.,
Former United States Senator.

XXXII. ARBITRATION

A League of Peace

ANDREW CARNEGIE, LL.D.,
Lord Rector St. Andrews University.

XXXIII. HISTORY

Value of History in the Formation of Character

CAROLINE HAZARD, M.A., LITT.D.,
President of Wellesley College.

XXXIV. THE POWER OF RELIGION

Religion Still the Key to History

SIMEON EBEN BALDWIN, LL.D.,
Former President American Historical Association, Professor of Constitutional Law at Yale University.

CONTENTS

LECTURE

XXXV. CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION

Social Culture in Education and Religion

WILLIAM T. HARRIS, LL.D.,
Former United States Commissioner of Education.

XXXVI. THE MYSTERIES

What Has Psychic Research Accomplished?

WILLIAM F. BARRETT, F.R.S., J.P.,
Royal College, Dublin; former President of the Society for Psychical Research.

XXXVII. HYPNOTISM

Its History, Nature, and Use

HAROLD M. HAYS, M.D.,
Mount Sinai Hospital.

XXXVIII. THE WILL

Its Cultivation and Power

JULES FINOT, LL.D.,
Editor of the *Revue*.

XXXIX. OUR HOPE

The Unknown God

SIR HENRY THOMPSON, M.D.

XL. OUR GOAL

The Making of a National Spirit

EDWIN A. ALDERMAN. LL.D.,
President of the University of Virginia.

Education and Democracy

GEORGE HARRIS, LL.D.,
President of Amherst College.

XXI

LIFE'S INTERCOURSE

"LANGUAGE AS THE INTERPRETER OF LIFE"

BY

BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE vast importance which the use of language assumes in early life is so obvious that it is usually overlooked. Man is so wholly a social animal that he forgets the fact. A grown person who has learned our life's elementary lessons may indeed abandon his kind and continue to exist, perhaps even to develop, in a hermit's solitude. But a six months' babe abandoned to "nature" must starve or be devoured. Even conceive of such a child as escaping and growing up alone amid the beasts. He would grow up a beast—or very little more. The acquisition of language is thus the first great step in our mental development. A deaf child learns, it is true, by imitations of actions, and so finally may have the world of language unlocked to it in books. But how slow is its advance compared to that which is first guided by the ear, that marvelous organism, that intricate triumph of mechanical construction.

Something of this immeasurable importance of language and the value of its systematic study has already been touched on by Mr. Wells in the previous address. It is here taken up and fully developed by President Wheeler, who ranks among our country's highest authorities upon this theme, he having been, in earlier days, professor of comparative philology and professor of Greek at Cornell. For the publication of the address thanks are due not only to President Wheeler himself but also to the Editors of the Atlantic Monthly, who first printed and copyrighted it and by whose kind permission it is used here.

Blood is thicker than water, but language is more than blood. Let any one debate with a modern Greek the question of old Greek pronunciation, and undertake to show him by the coolest of scientific demonstration that it differed in essential points from the modern, and he will find he has trespassed upon holy ground. Phonetic law is for these Greeks a pollution of the sacred temple grounds of patriotism. Belief in the essential identity of the modern language with the old stands as a fundamental article of the national faith. A Greek who would deny it is a high traitor. What wonder? It is the birthright of its tongue which gives his people its first claim, if not its only claim, to recognition as a nation.

When, on the evening of October 20, 1827, in the harbor of Navarino, the boom of the last cannon echoing back from the cliffs of old Sphakteria proclaimed the end of Turkish domination in the land of old time swayed by the Hellenes, there stood sponsorless and nameless before the nations of the world a population—not yet a people, but sundry scattered and ill-ordered groups of peoples whose habitations chanced to plant foundations on the sacred soil. It was the same old crumpled, sea-gnawed, sun-bathed Greece; but council-house and temple, palæstra and theatre, colonnade and college garden, were gone—all was gone that gave the ancient life of the dwellers in the land its outward form and semblance of a settled order, and made it a nation's life. Vague memories, half caricatured upon the traditions of a glorious past, floated in the air that hung over ruin and site; but where was the people to enter in to the inheritance, or who might claim "to know the manner of the god of the land"?

Neither the leading of goats to pasture over the slopes of Hymettus, the tilling of the battlefield of Mantinea, nor the sailing of fisher-boats through the blue waters of Salamis gave to men a claim on the traditions and name of the past, or provided a bond of union by virtue of which shepherds, peasants, traders, and sailors could be named a people and a nation. The population was of various blood—Greek, Albanian, Slavic, Frankish, Wallachian. But with all their diversity of blood, these men had been for once united in the sharing

of a common risk and the performance of one common task —the expulsion of the Turk. The fact of this union in risking and achieving gave the impulse and the occasion to the formation of nationality; the conditions under which the union was inspired gave the bond its insignia and its form. From the hearths of the monasteries and from the lamps and altars of the chapels, the enthusiasm of revolt had gathered its sacred fire. The old Byzantine Christian Church was the one institution surviving in that wasted land, not only to remind men of a life higher than that of "bread alone," but to maintain, by even the slenderest thread, connection with a past that had meaning and body and purpose such as vindicate the existence of nationality.

The language of the Church, kept alive in the ritual of the chapels and in the decadent learning of the monasteries, was in substance the language in which Demosthenes spoke and Paul wrote. Feeble as it might seem in comparison with the old standards, it still kept its connection with the old, and was capable of receiving limitless refreshment from the sources of the old. The various Greek patois of the peasants and villagers, on the other hand, had long since passed beyond the bounds of literary or national expression. They were now mere vanishing, enfeebled remnants of greatness, suited to the chatterings of goatherds and children and the hagglings of petty traders, or the chantings mayhap of the folk, but incapable of giving an expression to the wants and aspirations of a nation or of a people that had part in the doings of the great outer world. The same was true of the Albanian patois spoken by large masses of the population, and especially by most of the sailor-folk whose prowess on the sea had carried no small part of the burden of war. So it fell out that the new national consciousness arising from the ashes of the Revolution clothed itself in the language of the Church which erstwhile had been the nation. The Greek patois were lifted through this higher type of the language into the channels of connection with the old Greek speech that once had been the vehicle of a world-civilization, and a modern Greek, in outward form at least, half ancient, half recent, arose as the

standard language of the new nation, and became at once its educator, its voice, and its emblem. In form, in manner, in materials, it stands a living monument to the methods and the spirit in which the Greek nationality of the nineteenth century was requickened and reëstablished from the scanty remnants of the old. Even when it drapes the classical *himation* over the vulgate trousers and waistcoat of to-day in what seems fantastic masquerading, it pays thereby its tribute to the weirdly sentimental spirit of Philhellenism that has helped to make and maintain the state.

The lesson taught here in the small has, like so many of the products of this little land, its larger lesson in terms of greater things. Every standard language, as distinguished from local folk-speech and dialect, has been in the history of the world the exponent of some special movement in intercourse and civilization, the garb of some special type of human culture, the voice of some special form of instituted order among men—commercial, political, religious, or cultural. The very genius of a standard makes it something extended beyond its natural habitat to serve the conveniences of a wider intercourse. The standard divisions of time which deal in multiples like 12, 60, 360, hark back to the old Chaldean astronomers, from whom came the "60 minas make a talent," as well as the gross and the quire. Wherever 60 seconds make a minute the ancient empire of Mesopotamia has not utterly ceased to be. The conflict of the metre and the foot is still in substance a contest between the innovating Frenchman and the sturdy conservatism of English influence.

Latin, once the speech of a petty district by the Tiber, became the standard medium of intercourse for a mighty empire, absorbed into itself the spirit of the institution, became its outward embodiment, and survives to-day as a monument to the essential character of that institution better and truer than Colosseum or Forum. Its present place in education, in literature, in law, is determined by the place that Rome still holds in the organized life of Europe and in all organized life whose sources are in European civilization. A visible emblem is the place it still holds as the language of the Ro-

man Church; for the Roman Church is in all reality the Roman Empire expressed in terms of the things of the soul. The schoolboy learns from his Latin, if he learns it well, more than words, rules, paradigms, maxims, bits of history, or scraps of mythology; he drinks in the life of old Rome and the spirit of its institutions,—law, order, organization, authority. There is nothing left us, now that the Romans are gone, so Roman as Latin.

What Latin is to the Roman Church Sanskrit is to the Brahmin. Two thousand years and more ago it parted company with the vernacular, and ever since has been maintained as a more or less artificial standard, serving to express and embody the culture which made the classical age and literature of India. What the Romanic languages are to Latin, the various Prakrits of India are to Sanskrit; and one of these in particular, the Pali, as the language of the earliest Buddhistic writings, has become a standard, lifted above time and habitat, and is the distinctive idiom of Buddhism.

When, with the emergence of a national spirit in the form of the Protestant Revolution, German speech in the sixteenth century pushed its way through the crust of Latin that had hitherto overspread the entire literary expression of the land, there *was* no German language; there was only a tangle of local dialects, none of which had been deemed worthy of conveying a message to Germany at large, few of aught else than the quick-vanishing message of the lips, and that in the common homely matters of every-day village life. In the fire and zeal of a great national uprising, of a struggle that was a battle of language standards as well as of creeds, the German language sprang into existence. It came in response to a need, but it was men, and the message of men to men struggling for expression, that made it. The idiom which carried the burden of the great controversy melted with the heat of conviction, and moulded itself into the form of a language that could voice the thought of a whole people.

The conquest of Italy made Latin, the crystallization of the Brahmin caste made Sanskrit, the preaching of Buddha made Pali, the dominance of Attic standard Greek over all

the dialects of Greece is a reflection of Athens's fourth-century dominance in the sphere of thought and art, the modern Greek is daughter of the Revolution, German as a nation's speech is an outgrowth of Luther's Reformation. Most great standard languages will be found to have taken their rise in some movement of human interest that stirred the lives and thought of men toward a larger sympathy and a larger intercourse than the things of village, clan, or cult demanded. It is the same class of movements which have begotten nationalities, at least the nationalities of the modern type.

The ancient state was founded upon religion, and the bond of religion was in its genesis a bond of blood. The modern state tends to obscure the bonds and boundaries of blood and to substitute for them the ties of common interest and common conditions. Trade, intercourse, like customs, like forms of life, like forms of belief, like forms of thought, count more than blood. And so it comes about that more and more as the world grows riper the paths of nationality and of language unite. What levels the way for the one gives life and being to the other. The oldest state is the tribe, and its watchword is blood; the modern state is the nation, and the emblem which the course of history is choosing for it unmistakably is language. The toils and trials of a quasi-nation like Austria-Hungary, with its plurality of tongues, only prove the rule. What we have here is a refuge, not a nation.

But a national language is more than an emblem; more than a flag or a coat of arms; more than a monument to a great historic nation-making act, which may serve as a rallying point for patriotism and the sentiment of nationality. It is all that, but it is thousandfold more. A written creed or constitution which cannot be amended or reinterpreted may stand as a landmark and a sacred relic, and appeal to the reverence and even the affection of men; but a very different thing it is from a body of usage and precedent fashioned in historic testings, such as is the English constitution. That bears within itself at any given time a record of past experience in composite. A man's character at any given time is said to be the resultant of all the conscious choices of his life. Mis-

takes have left their scars, self-denials have toughened the fibre of the will, lies have left behind them perverted vision of the truth, deeds of mercy have made their deposit of mercifulness.

Language is of like sort with character. Every speaker in all the generations, in every word he has uttered, has helped to build it. Light-winged words, they sped through the barriers of the lips, but could not be lost. They either tended to strengthen the standing norm—and that either in hearer, speaker, or both—or they played their part in starting divergence and change or in loosening the foundations of the norm.

The crude methods of the new-born science of language are as yet but playing with the pebbles on the shore of a mighty deep. We read of etymologies, but they only tear away with cumbrous hand the silken warp from the cocoons of words, and miss the pattern and the motive of the weaving, and ignore the life within. Words are not words without context, motive, and life. Synonyms galore printed in Italics cannot compass a description of their life-values. The clumsy devices of letters cannot yield a vision of even their bodily form. To know them really one must know them warm—warm with the life-blood of actual living speech; one must have met them under every variety of life-conditions; one must have "summered and wintered" with them.

We arrange them in paradigms, and think we have compassed and measured them; but these paradigm pigeonholes only betray the limitations of our own petty logic. We try to cram words into compartments under our so-called rules of syntax, and the splendid failure which results offers the finest demonstration of the narrow range of reason as compared with the great background of soul-life, the vast reaches of the divine indefinite.

Grammar is to the average healthy human being the driest and deathliest of all the disciplines. Except as it serves a temporary practical purpose of offering a first approach to the acquisition of a language, or of presenting to maturer study a convenient tentative and artificial classification of certain facts, it brings spiritual atrophy and death to him who gives

and him who takes. Treated as an end unto itself, it desiccates teacher and pupil alike. The fact requires neither demonstration nor illustration. The reason for it, too, is not far to seek. Grammar represents the application of a method that is lifeless to a subject-matter that is life, and the discrepancy between the method and the matter determines the spiritual revulsion against the former. It is a case of inevitable and eternal misfit. Grammar as we practise it is derived from the Sophists and the Stoics, and is still, however much we try to disguise the fact, based upon a confidence in logic, or something in the ordering faculties of the intellect close akin thereto. But language, which is the property of life and personality in the whole, will not yield its secret to the meagre analyses of reason and intellect, which are by their nature partial, which see as in a glass darkly, and not face to face. Language cannot be unlocked by logic; it can be unlocked only by sympathy.

It would not be my purpose to deny for a moment the possibility of a science of language or to question its utility; far from it. As little would I undertake to deny the possibility of a science of theology, merely because it fails, as it notably does, to cover and represent the facts of living faith. But what we must recognize, what we must in honesty confess, though it gives us pain to do it, is that the finest endeavors of the finest scientific grammar, like all other processes which apply the purely objective tests to the products of life, and preeminently of soul-life, can only serve at the best as correctives and stimulants of vision in detail; they cannot induct any human being into real understanding and appreciation of the life of the whole. Learn and know Meyer's Grammar and the Kühner-Blass from title-page to index, and what a pitiful travesty that by itself would yield upon a real sympathy with the magnificent idiom in which—not merely *through* which by its content of idea, but *in which* itself—Sophocles conveys the touch of the Hellenic fervors and unfolds the Hellenic attitude toward the universe of being: love, awe, joy, hope, regret, simplicity, harmony, beauty, temperance.

If language were a mass of conventional cipher, like a

Volapük or the price-marks of a secretive hardware shop; if the ordering faculties that haunt the superficies of mind had dominated it entire and formed it, as they have the price-marks, then would there be some hope for grammar. A grammar of Volapük is an eminently satisfactory thing. A code telegram can be translated by purely mechanical processes. The translation, however, of a literary masterpiece, in which language is at the highest flush of vitality, is one of the severest and most evasive tasks to which human endeavor can address itself. You can transfer patches of flesh and skin, and even infuse blood, but you cannot transfer life from one body to another. Words do not live in dictionaries any more than plants in herbariums. They live in the usage of living men. Every word, every phrase, has it subtle, unanalyzable coloring, derived from myriad associations in myriad sentences, as impossible of summary and final description as a personality.

A word has a personal character, and wherever it goes it carries like a human being its character with it; so that in every use of it there is implicit the power and the possibility of standing for vastly more than the special emergency seemed at first to demand. Jest and poetry depend for much of their flavor, as did old-fashioned town-meetings, upon this habit of taking along the entirety of individual character. Put language under the same severe restraints which depress personality and turn the town-meeting into a battalion of soldiers, and you have the prose of the law-code and the auctioneer's catalogue. But poetry, which always antedates prose, as the Vedic hymns antedate the Brahmanas, and Homer and the dramatic poets the orators, is far more in accord with the inner spirit and purpose of speech than is prose. Language is indeed, as Emerson said, only "fossil poetry."

Language is through and through a social product. Schleicher, the fine old botanist-philologist of Jena, tried his best in vain to apply to it the analogies of his flower-beds and kitchen-garden. Stammbaums and branches have gone the way of roots and stems. The laws of sound-change, instead of being like the laws of nature governing the growth of plants and the revolving of planets, prove to be founded on the tendency to

social compromise, in the necessity which men are under of getting along together and understanding one another, and resemble, therefore, the laws which govern dress-coats, dinner-calls, the holding of forks, and the wording of wedding-cards.

Even in the outward characteristics of their structure, languages represent in the grand style of summary the dominant social conditions in the history of those peoples who speak them. Thus, at one end of the line stand the so-called agglutinative languages, at the other the monosyllabic. The agglutinative languages, of which the Bantu tongues of Africa and the Mongolian of Central Asia afford illustration, represent the experience of widely scattered populations which maintain over a vast extent of territory a desultory communication with one another. Corresponding to the necessities of the case which demand that every idea and phase of idea be explicitly indicated, these languages are perfectly transparent; that is, perfectly "regular" in structure. Like modifications of ideas are always expressed by like inflexional elements. Little or nothing is left to be inferred. Every division and subdivision of the thought is duly tagged and labelled.

The Chinese goes to the other extreme. Here almost everything is implicit. Far more is left to be inferred from context, word-order, and intonation than is really presented in bodily form. The monosyllabic dabs in which the Chinaman speaks are mere running hints—a shorthand of speech condensed to the uttermost. They are the natural products of a stable, long-established, densely-compacted civilization, in which unwritten precedent outweighs written statutes; in which multifold social compromise has finally made life artificial in place of natural, and its acts symbolic rather than presentive. The monosyllabic languages have been produced under tremendous social pressure. They represent, from the artistic as well as the historical point of view, the most finished type of human speech. The maximum of idea is *implicit* in their structure. They contain the minimum of mechanism for the maximum of expression.

We might multiply illustrations of the way in which language, sensitive as milk to its environment, takes upon it

the impress of social conditions as they develop and pass. The modern rapid development of intercourse is, for instance, making itself slowly but irresistibly felt in dulling the colors which mark the linguistic areas on the map of the civilized world. Not only interchange of loan-words, but in far subtler form the acceptance of common syntactical moulds, is gradually lifting the great European culture-languages toward the levels of a common medium of communication. While the question whether English, French, Russian, is to become the universal language is awaiting the slow unfolding of political and commercial history, this deep and subtle drift into unity is steadily advancing toward a distant goal. It means no more than that the languages, in their chameleon habit, are taking on the colorings of internationalism.

Man is first and foremost a social being. Language is the social bond, and therefore man's badge of membership in the body social; but more than that, it is the embodiment of the nature and spirit of that social fabric to which the individual owns allegiance, and through which he becomes a man. If that social spirit is the *logos*, then language is the logos made flesh. Man as a member of society is assigned to his place and is made by the language he commands. More or less unconsciously we even locate men by the language they use. So fine and exacting are our tests, for instance, that one who is to command a hearing as representative of a type of the higher civilization of a nation must, on platform or in pulpit, speak in the recognized standard of that civilization. The dialectal colorings of province and district, much as they may delight us in other ways and for other purposes, carry insensibly with them the impression of limitation and provincialism. Through the language a man speaks, or the form of it he uses at any given time he betrays the scheme of human culture and the order of human society with which at the moment he is in sympathy.

These considerations concerning the place and meaning of language in human society determine what we believe is its place and meaning in the education of mankind. Through language nations in the modern sense are made and held to-

gether. Through language the individual is lifted into membership in the nation. The child comes into the world and finds a language awaiting him. The acquiring of that language constitutes his first education. Compared with this all other education is of entirely secondary importance. Observation of the processes by which a child acquires its mother tongue teaches that it is not the language which is drilled into the child's mind, but it is the child's mind which is fitted into and expanded into the language. Words and expressions come to the child, not as full and finished globules of thought, but as empty shells which he must fill with idea, as spools on which he must wind the warp of thought. Words are not defined for the child. If they were, he could not understand. He must learn their various uses from single experiences, and by slow and gradual processes arrange the concepts, which by associations, metaphors, and metonymies cling together in the mind and usage of the language community, into their compact place within the shell or about the spool. In doing this he is coming into possession of the folk-wisdom of the folk; he is coming into accord with the mind of the historic-social body of which he is to be a member; he is learning to estimate and quote the values of the world in terms of the standard coinage of his place and time; he is making himself standing ground in human society; he is forming and building a *pou sto* for the exercise and development of his free personality. Without school or school-master, text-book or pedagogue, the child and then the man are brought before the seat of the greatest and wisest teacher their lives are ever in all their scope to have, and this teacher is their mother tongue. It is a teacher whose learning they are never to exhaust, and whose stimulating influence toward mental growth is not likely soon to fail. Happy are they who are born into the inheritance of a speech developed and enriched by highest literary use and by long traditions of noble expression; for then it will be a teacher to age as well as to youth. Happy are they who, through the formal education of the schools, are brought into touch with the life attitude of other peoples as embodied in their languages, and especially of those peoples

whose spiritual life has blended into the early currents of our own.

It is particularly, however, for the years of earlier mental development that language plays its chief involuntary part as educator. That which it does now without conscious direction provides the basis and guidance for use in formal and systematic education. It points the way to what is the prime consideration in education, even if it does not swallow up and include all others.

We educate a human being to the end that his personality may most nearly fulfil its inherent possibilities within the human society of which it is to be a part. We do not seek primarily, if we are wise, to fill the mind with various knowledge; for we know that the mind is not so much a reservoir as a mill-wheel, not so much a storehouse as a laboratory, not so much a receptacle as an instrument. We do not, if we are wise, rear the child in isolation from life or in untamed individualism; for we know that man is born to live in society, and that society is historically conditioned, and that the life man lives is part of a succession—a historical life.

What we really do first of all, if we are wise, is to take the budding bit of individuality in hand, and induce it, constrain it, persuade it, cajole it, overawe it, and, if need be, spank it, into recognition of the existing order. The first thing a child has to learn is to do as it is told to do. To become a historical being is its mission, and as soon as possible it must recognize the authority of the historically constituted order. The acceptance of the authority of society is the gate through which one passes into freedom. The stern law it is, like the rough hand of the *paidagogos*, that leads us unto Christ; it is through obedience and conformity to the spirit that dominates the world that we come to a realization of ourselves, and to our birthright of freedom as sons of God. In the isolation of selfhood we sit without the pale and yearn for the husks the swine eat, but once we have set our faces toward home and order there is enough and to spare. This is what is meant, alike in the statutes of society, in the constitution of the state, and in the oracles of God, by the "consent of the governed."

It is the mission of language and literature in education to bring young individual life into accord with the moulds of historical life. Through word and phrase and sentence, through tale and myth and verse, mind is quickened to enter in and occupy these nests and shells that have sheltered other human thought. Mind is expanded in the moulds of mind; not in the lifeless geometric cells of logic and reasoning, but in the life-cells shapen to contain the products of the soul—the whole, the living soul.

The practically logical mind is a healthy, well-nourished mind—nothing more or less. Such mind is produced by feeding it during the years of development upon healthy normal food, not upon the embalmed food of the logicians or the chemists. The Chinese mandarins, trained upon language and innocent of pure logic, are said to be the keenest practical logicians of the world. The forms of reasoning, indeed, to which a child is stimulated in catching the meanings of sentences of the mother speech, or which a boy uses in making out the meaning of a sentence in his Cæsar from the imperfect data of words and syntax, are the forms of contingent reasoning, the ones which are almost exclusively employed in the decisions and judgments of actual life. Men who pretend to regulate their lives according to well-constructed syllogisms—and it must be pretence or self-deception, for there are no such syllogisms in *life*—are generally regarded as impossible men. They are what are politely known as cranks.

The methods of thought which are based upon objective tests, and which, whether applied in the field of the humanities or of nature studies, we call scientific, have their place in education as well as those we have discussed; but in elementary education they are to be introduced gradually, and as correctives rather than as staples. Nature study need not be scientific any more than language study. We are not concerned here with any conflict between the study of nature and the study of the humanities, nor are we making protest against the scientific method of studying either; we are insisting merely upon the educational value that inheres in the *direct* study of language and of language as literature.

Literary training can never be disjoined from language study. There never was a suggestion more perverse than that which recommends the substitution of translations for originals, on the theory that all the great and choice ideas can thus be exploited as well as through the toil of learning the language. What, pray, are these ideas? Why not pick them out, arrange them alphabetically by initial words, and print them in double columns like market-lists? The reason straight and simple is that they are inseparable from the language. Language is no mere vehicle. It is itself in large part its own content.

The main educative purposes of literary study and of language study are, in the end, one and the same. They approach the mysteries of the folk-mind directly. They deal face to face with the soul and its expression. Contact and sympathy are their instruments; not the lens, the scalpel, and the syllogism. They throw wide open the window and look straight out into life and the day.

So long as intimations of the larger life, the life social and the life spiritual, have power to call man out of himself and his cell, these studies have their place in the schooling of mankind; for the reach of the soul is higher than the clutch of the hand.

XXII

THE BOY

"HIS PREPARATION FOR MANHOOD"

BY

DANIEL COIT GILMAN

FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY AND OF THE CARNEGIE INSTITUTION

THE name of Daniel Coit Gilman has long ranked among the very foremost of American educators and scholars. Five years ago he resigned his position at the head of the world-renowned university of Johns Hopkins, having assumed the presidency of the Carnegie Institution, which was then established in Washington for the advancement of scientific research. This distinguished office he resigned in 1904 at the approach of age; but he still remains an official connection with both institutions. Perhaps in all our land there is no man who has had such long, such wide, and such varied experience as Dr. Gilman with boys, and with young men just ceasing to be boys. Therefore his words upon this subject must have a permanent value and interest for us all.

Our previous address dealt with the child, the problems that surround his earliest days, the mists in which his emerging mental power is involved, and through which, seeking to guide him, we grope blindly. As he advances into boyhood his steps grow firmer, the enwrapping mist less dense. Something of vagueness must always intervene, hiding each human personality from all the rest, yet as the child learns to talk and to think he begins to bridge the gap which holds his mind secreted from older minds. He analyzes himself in some crude way, and so helps us to analyze

him. Moreover, as Dr. Gilman well points out, memory, each man's memory of his own boyhood, scarce reaching back below the age of five or ten, still further enables us to understand. Hence the chief problems which confront most boyhoods are well known. They can be faced and fought. Much help, very much help indeed, can be given to the lad in solving his own problems. And alas, so much is needed, so much more even than we can give! To start "right" upon one's manhood is no easy task. There are so many hampering habits easily acquired, so many pitfalls everywhere ensnaring, so many follies, so many vices.

While the difficulties stand out clearer than those of childhood, the problems are more serious; they loom larger and seem far more doubtful of solution. The child yields to control, but with springing youth the hand of guidance is thrown aside. The fences are broken down, the young steer will to the meadow, the young blood will to the fray. Let us seek such knowledge on the subject, such assistance in handling our own, as one man's venerable thought and experience can offer.

I AM not sure that people are agreed upon the limits of boyhood. Shakespeare divides life into seven ages, of which the second is "the whining schoolboy, with his satchel and shining morning face, creeping like snail unwillingly to school," and other writers regard with a superstitious reverence the multiples of seven, as climacterics leading up to "the grand climacteric" of nine times seven; but I prefer to count the first twenty or twenty-one years as those of boyhood; then comes early manhood—another twenty years; the third score is that of middle age and maturity, and the fourth, of seniority. It is only centenarians who can truly be called old in these days which have so recently known a Gladstone, Manning, Ruskin, Tennyson, Bismarck, Moltke, and a Kaiser Wilhelm; octogenarians and nonagenarians are only in advancing years. At Commencements, gray-haired men who have grandsons in college allude to their classmates as "the boys," and appear to think that calling a man young makes him so. But the boys I am to speak of have not been to college; they are under their majority, and most of them less than eighteen years of age. I refer to the boys of Berkeley,

of Exeter, of Andover, of St. Paul's, of Norwich, of Lawrenceville, and of hosts of other schools. I do not refer to the ghosts of boys, like one that went the rounds with Doctor Holmes when he returned, after fifty years or so, to the scenes of his youth and the academy in Andover. "The ghost of a boy was at my side," he says, "as I wandered among the places he knew so well." The ghost went with him even to the railroad station. "Give me two tickets to Boston," said the Autocrat of the Breakfast Table; but the little ghost replied, "When you leave this place you leave me behind you." "One ticket, then, to Boston," said the tale-teller; "and good-bye, little ghost."

But in reality do men ever say good-bye to "the little ghost"? Is he not with us night and day, summer and winter, all our lives through, and are we sure that even death will part us from him? Ask the older men of your acquaintance and see if the ghost of a boy is not always near by. Ask even Doctor Holmes—if only one could still ask him "over the tea-cups"—if the ghost of a boy whom he left at the Andover station did not fly through the air and meet him when he reached his house on Beacon Street. Ask him if the little ghost has never appeared in Cambridge or in Berkshire—yes, ask him if the ghost is not always with him, sometimes a recording angel, and sometimes a prophet of immortality.

Is it not worth while for us older people to tell the boys that a little ghost will always keep them company—that as they grow older he will remind them perpetually of the past; every peccadillo will be remembered, and all healthy, honest deeds will be treasured in the cells of memory "to be used as directed"?

During recent years there have been some very curious studies respecting the natural history of boys. Mr. Howells, the novelist, has written a book that he calls *A Boy's Town*, and in its pages he delineates with the realistic touch of a master the thoughts of a boy between his third and his eleventh year, who grew up in a country town on the Miami River. Literature is full of autobiographies, but here we have something quite unusual, something quite fresh in the literature of childhood. It is a picture drawn with accuracy by a writer while still young, of the environment in which he was brought up. Here we may

learn what an American boy surmised, discovered, and believed in respect to the world in which he was placed.

By a curious coincidence, whether conscious or unconscious I cannot say, a celebrated French writer, whose *nom de plume* is Pierre Loti, has drawn a companion picture to that of Howells. In these two books we may compare the Huguenot and the American. The Frenchman, with a lively imagination and a love of adventure, was subjected to the depressing influences of a French country town. On the prairie all was freedom; in the province all was restraint. But we see how both natures rose above their belongings, how the self-determining power of the will made them both keen observers, graceful narrators, distinguished novelists.

One of the most remarkable studies of the inherent tendency of boys to organize society may be found in a paper entitled "Rudimentary Society among Boys," that was written some time ago by Mr. J. Hemsley Johnson, a connection of Reverdy Johnson, the Maryland statesman. In this paper we have the story of the life among the McDonogh school boys, in their country home a few miles from Baltimore. Several hundreds of acres, with predominant woodlands, belonged to the school, but the boys thought that the land and all that grew or was nourished upon it belonged to them; so they established their rights to the walnut trees and the birds' nests, and afterward to the portions of cultivated grounds. The germs of civilized society were soon developed. "No right without its duty, no duty without its rights." Authority, law, penalty, inheritance, trade, circulating medium, were all evolved by the boys.

Doctor Stanley Hall has published a kindred memoir, in which he has described the amusements of children. He calls his paper "The Story of a Sand Pile."

Perhaps we are coming to the time when the comparative biography of boys will take its place beside the comparative history of nations and the comparative geography of lands. We shall not only be able to distinguish how boys differ from men, and how their ways differ from those of girls; but we may learn how boys differ from boys, at different periods, in different families, with different talents and with different hopes and expectations.

Boys may be classified into genera and species, not according to what they know, but according to what they are. The school affords an easy method of placing them in forms, grades, classes —almost as exact as that of the tailor who places them in coats of different sizes—but what a boy has learned is only one element in an estimate of his worth. It is more important to discover what are his capacities, to what intellectual and moral group he belongs; what are his tendencies toward nodosities that must be counteracted; what are his aptitudes to be cultivated; what are the habits that must be regulated so that they shall be helps and not hinderances in the battle of life.

With all the accumulated experience of mankind it is still extremely difficult to foretell what a boy will become. It is possible to predict the speed that a thoroughbred colt will approximate, as Professor Brewer has shown, or to anticipate the quality of a terrier or a pointer, of an Ayrshire or a Durham; but who is wise enough to discover in the nursery the coming statesmen, poets, scholars, and divines, or even to foretell what qualities will be developed in any group of schoolboys? Who can estimate the power of the individual, the self, the ego, that dwells in each bodily frame, and asserts in the course of life its supreme authority? One of the most impressive sermons delivered by Charles Kingsley in Westminster Abbey was a sermon on the monosyllabic, the monogram, I.

No parent, no teacher, no physician, no philosopher is wise enough to speak infallibly upon such important questions. There are no logical formulas, no canons of criticism, no physiological tests by which conclusions may be reached. Nevertheless, there are signs and tokens which indicate the probabilities, and by these the wise instructor, the observing mother, the prudent father will be guided.

One way of arriving at a knowledge of boys is by reminiscence. Old men like to renew their youth by retrospection. They imagine themselves young because they recall so vividly the days of their childhood, but they are in danger both of Scylla and Charybdis. They may err by vanity and imagine that they were more excellent than they really were; or they may err by modesty, and blame themselves for faults which were not

so personal as they were circumstantial. In rare cases we may get an introspective view of a boy's life, written while he was a boy, but I do not remember any masculine diary like that of Marie Bashkirtseff, the prodigy of egotism, the genius run wild, the morbid self-auscultator who could listen to the beatings of her own heart and register the sounds of her own respiration.

It is almost a fashion in these days for men who have acquired distinction to write the memoirs of their boyhood. Two of my colleagues at Johns Hopkins, Professor Gildersleeve, the Grecian, and Professor Newcomb, the astronomer, published accounts of the "formative influences" to which they were subjected. I learn that my successor, President Remsen, has this year done something similar in his reminiscences for the history of the New York City College, his Alma Mater. President Dwight and President A. D. White once wrote similar articles. Noteworthy Englishmen—Tyndall, Lecky, Farrar, and Frederic Harrison among the number—have written the story of their youth. Ruskin, poet, artist, naturalist, philosopher, revealed under such cryptogamic titles as the Springs of Wandel, Herne Hill, Almond Blossoms, and the Banks of Tay, the life of a boy as it appears to a septuagenarian. Franklin wrote his autobiography, so did Gibbon, so did Rousseau; and so we can go farther and farther back in history till we reach the Confessions of Saint Augustine. It is interesting to notice that among the writers of our own day many fall back on the term of the day, heredity, which seems to serve equally well as a scapegoat and as a mentor.

The sum of all that I have been able to discover from these and many other writings, and from innumerable opportunities to study boys, may be very briefly stated.

Every boy differs from every other boy in character as he does in appearance. Even twins, while they closely resemble one another in many respects, may differ essentially in fundamental tastes and talents. Mr. Galton says that extreme similarity and extreme dissimilarity are nearly as common between twins of the same sex as moderate resemblance. If this is confirmed, what becomes of heredity?

The corollary is obvious, that plans of education should as

far as possible be adapted to individual requirements; but as every boy is preparing for life among his fellows, and as Providence has so ordered it that he is strongly influenced by other boys, it follows that to treat him alone, away from comrades, in the backwoods, in a cell, under exclusive instruction, is only justifiable under extraordinary circumstances. He comes into the world not only as an individual, with his own responsibilities and possibilities, but as one of a family, a neighborhood, a race, from which he cannot be extricated except by death. Isolation is therefore as unnatural as it is undesirable and difficult.

Every boy is influenced both by his inheritance and his environment. Yet the laws of heredity in the human species are not well enough known to give us any certain indications of what the child of any parents will become, while the conditions in which a person lives are as complex as the elements that nourish his body, the air he breathes, the water he drinks; as subtle and insinuating as the tones of the voice, the glance of the eye, the nod of the head, the pressure of the hand; as influential as religious faith, the forms of civil government, the habits of society, the lessons of antiquity, the examples of good men; and as trifling as a careless word, a thoughtless joke, a timely hint, a friendly warning or a loving smile.

Until he reaches maturity every boy requires positive guidance from those who have had a longer experience in the ways of the world. It is always cruel, and it may be criminal, to allow a youth to experiment for himself upon conduct—to say that he must sow his own wild oats, that experience is the best teacher, that he must choose his own course. Every boy is entitled to know what older persons have discovered of the laws of conduct, and to receive restraint, caution, and warning until his eyes have been opened and his powers of judgment developed. Nobody questions that he ought to be taught the laws of health, of diet, of poisons, of climate, or the laws that protect his person and property; and it is surprising that anybody should question his right to initiation, by stringent discipline, into the laws of intellectual and moral well-being. Every boy, whether he wishes it or not, should be trained. Yet the contrary doctrine is covertly held, if not openly avowed, by many a tender mother and by

many a generous father. Note the autobiography of John Stuart Mill.

Neither precocity nor dulness is any certain index of the future of a boy. Only a wise man can tell the difference between the priggishness of conceit and the display of unusual talent, and it takes a superlatively wise man to devise right methods for exciting temperaments that are dull, or, on the other hand, to guide a genius. Abnormal brilliancy and abnormal slowness are usually the result of abnormal physical conditions, and physiologists are only just beginning to show to ordinary parents how these unusual conditions may be discovered and treated. When we see a man we cannot tell what sort of a boy he came from, and when we see a boy we cannot tell what sort of man he will make. The great Emperor Charles V, who grew old prematurely, was slow in his development, and was nearly twenty-one before his beard grew. The facts lately collected by Doctor Scripture in regard to mathematicians show how impossible it is to prophesy in respect to the development of hypothetical genius. Some who have risen to great distinction, like Gauss, Ampère, Safford, were precocious mathematicians in their youth; another boy of extraordinary parts, Thomas Fuller, the Virginia calculator, remained an idiot. Daniel Webster, greatest of New England orators, broke down, we are told, in his early speaking. Most boys that run away from home take the road to ruin; but the liberator of Greece, Sir Richard Church, who died a few years ago in Athens, honored by a public funeral and by a monument raised by the Greek nation to commemorate his services, was a boy of under size, of Quaker parentage, who, before he was sixteen years of age, ran away from home and "took the king's shilling."

The influence of modern psycho-physiological inquiries upon the coming generations is still undetermined. The good that is aimed at may perhaps surpass the evil that is done. Certainly, in these days, when morbid self-consciousness, extreme sensitiveness, bashfulness, shyness, and timidity are so frequently apparent, the wise parent, the wise teacher will hesitate before encouraging in his own family or his own school too intense and too prolonged introspection. Give the boys plenty of open air,

and when they cannot have this, encourage within doors exercise in hand-craft, the use of tools, and knowledge of the book of sports—not to the exclusion of other studies, but as collateral security that the mind and the body shall be simultaneously developed. As an example, the stories that we have of Daniel Webster's boyhood are very instructive. You may find them in Morse's life of the great orator of New England. The infant was a rather sickly little being at its birth, and some cheerful neighbors predicted that it would not live long. For many years the boy was weak and delicate. Manual labor, the common lot of farmer's sons, was out of the question in his case. But now hear the other side of the story. "Young Webster was allowed to devote much of his time to play, to play of the best sort, in the woods and fields." The bar and the senate and the cabinet tell the conclusion of a career which began with such meagre hopes.

Healthy, out-of-door lives, directed toward objects of enjoyment, of observation, of sport, of acquisition, are better for boys than exclusive devotion to books, and especially than habits of introspection, self-examination, casuistry, journal-writing.

Of all the facts that the world has accumulated with respect to the art of training, but little has been reduced to intelligible terms respecting the methods of producing this or that variety of character. Certain general principles have indeed been established, like the vague laws of health: "eat nothing improper, drink nothing improper, do nothing improper, and you will be well"; but how shall we counteract the insidious microbe that may ruin all our expectations of health and thwart our incessant carefulness? "Go to school, learn your lessons, win your diplomas," are directions as good as they are simple; but how shall the bacteria be got rid of that appear in the forms of bad company, laziness, lack of interest in certain branches of study, inability to master the calculus or the Greek subjunctive, deceitful facility, corrosive vanity, excessive versatility, unusual obstinacy, or that incapacity to accept discipline which is the exact reverse of what George Eliot calls "genius"? Why is it that no school of painting can promise to make a great painter of any candidate, however promising; that no college can assure a

parent that his son shall become a scholar; that no lessons in English composition will make an orator or a poet; that prolonged studies in history and politics do not produce statesmen? Is it not still more remarkable that the incessant care of the best and wisest parents and teachers is so often counteracted by the examples and the temptations of boyhood and manhood?

Schools are not restricted to boyhood. They are the arrangements of nature and Providence and society, by which, at every stage of our existence, we are prepared for something beyond. The cradle is a school, and so is the nursery. The kindergarten and the infant class are of a little higher grade. Grammar schools and colleges come next. Then come the high schools that we call universities, with their departments of law, medicine, theology, and the liberal arts. All along the course are supplementary schools, spreading out their tentacles for the capture of those who are not bound elsewhere. Sooner or later for us all begins the pedagogy of life—the school of practice, where the lessons of the books are applied to the affairs of men. So Milton sings:

> "All is, if I have grace to use it so,
> As ever in my great Task-master's eye."

Likewise George Herbert:

> "Lord, with what care thou hast begirt us round!
> Parents first season us, then schoolmasters
> Deliver us to laws; they send us bound
> To rules of reason, holy messengers."

From the cry of the infant to the last breath of the centenarian, life is one long school, without holidays or vacations. Each day has its lessons, each decade its reviews.

We often read in the newspapers that some prominent person was a self-made man. Francis Lieber used to ridicule this phrase by saying that he should like to stand by while a man was making himself. But the absurdity of such a phrase has never been more clearly stated than by Mr. Charles A. Dana, in his recent eulogy of Horace Greeley. Mr. Greeley is an example almost as striking as Benjamin Franklin or Abraham Lincoln, of what a man may become without scholastic discipline. The

three were men of exceptional talent, exceptional vigor, and exceptional power of will. Mr. Dana says of Greeley: "He was a man of almost no education; indeed, of no education at all except what he had acquired for himself," and then he adds these sage words: "The worst school that a man can be sent to (and the worst of all it is for a man of genius) is what is called a self-education. There is no greater misfortune for a man of extraordinary talent than to be educated by himself, because he has of necessity a very poor schoolmaster. There is nothing more advantageous to an able youth than to be thrown into contact with other youths in the conflict of study and in the struggle for superiority in the school and in the college. That was denied to Mr. Greeley. He knew no language but his own; but of that he possessed the most extraordinary mastery."

And now I have a few words to add in respect to what is commonly called "the preparatory school," the place where boys are prepared for college. Not all its pupils will go to college, it is true, but all have chosen, or have been chosen, to follow a course of training which, by the common consent of educated men, leads up to a college course. "He was fitted for college" is a phrase that marks an epoch in education quite as distinctly as the phrase a "Bachelor of Arts." It means that a youth of fair parts, during his teens, has been taught the elements of mathematical science, and two or three languages in addition to his mother tongue; that he has been introduced to a knowledge of the natural world, and that he has some acquaintance with his own country and his own stock. It should also mean that he has learned the difficult art of study, and has acquired good habits of attention, memory, and simple accurate expression. In addition, the phrase is beginning to imply that the boy has begun the study of some branch of science, and has at least learned how to observe the phenomena of the animate life and of the inanimate forces by which he is surrounded. Side by side with these intellectual lessons moral discipline is also given.

Certainly one of the first requisites of a good preparatory school is bodily discipline. This is partly to be secured by watchfulness in respect to posture, diet, repose, gymnastics, within the school walls; it is to be still further promoted by

abundant exercise in the open air. Manly sports with the bat and the oar, running, jumping, bowling, swimming, rowing, riding, fencing, boxing, and, if possible, sailing, are all to be encouraged. Nor is military training to be underrated. The systematic exercise of every limb and every muscle is desirable, not under rules too rigidly laid down by the higher authorities, but under regulations spontaneously developed by the youth. It is generally conceded that just now, in England and this country, there is danger of intemperance in sport. This may be less disastrous than intemperance in drink or meat; nevertheless there is such a thing as inebriety in athletic games. I do not refer to the danger of broken limbs and bruised faces, for they are rarely enduring injuries, but to the danger of unfair rivalries, of bad associations, of peculiar temptations in the anticipation and enjoyment of victory or in the depression of defeat, in the neglect of other and higher scholastic duties, in the waste of time and money on costly journeys, perhaps in extravagant hospitality. The boys themselves must be encouraged to correct these tendencies, but they have a right to expect that we older boys will remind them of their highest obligations and encourage their fulfilment. With the reasonable control which players, teachers, parents, can readily exercise, and which the young ladies and the newspapers might greatly encourage, the just medium can be secured, and athletics continue to be an essential factor in the training of American boys.

The importance of mental habits is sometimes forgotten in the eagerness to impart knowledge. Perhaps the colleges are more to blame for this than the schools; for the colleges receive their pupils on examination, and examinations are contrived so as to show sometimes what the freshman knows or sometimes what he does not know. Usually the examiners have not time, if they have the disposition, and if they have time and disposition they may not have the capacity, to put the candidate to any other test than his ability to answer certain questions.

Examinations are a great stumbling-block not only to the pupil, but also to the examiner, and I shall not now discuss this vexatious theme. However, this much may be said. That teacher fails who keeps the coming examination perpetually in

sight. It is his business to think of the minds of his pupils, individually, to strengthen, prune, stimulate, train, the various qualities exhibited by each scholar. He should indeed impart knowledge, not forgetful that it is as true in the examination room as anywhere else, "if there be knowledge, it shall vanish away"; but he should also enforce the formation of habits—and especially at the schoolboy age—of close attention, tenacious memory, and accurate statement. These three mental virtues are not unworthy to be named after faith, hope, and charity, the trinal virtues of St. Paul—attention, memory, truth, and the greatest of these is truth.

The intellectual lessons that boys receive should be so imparted that they may promote the formation of moral habits. Accuracy, carefulness, truthfulness of statement, fidelity, thoroughness, courtesy, self-control, deference, consideration, respect, temperance, these are virtues that may readily be developed while the boy is crossing the *pons asinorum* or stumbling over a sentence of Tacitus.

"Refrain to-night," said Hamlet to the queen, "and that shall lend a kind of easiness to the next abstinence; the next more easy; for use almost can change the stamp of nature and master the devil or throw him out with wondrous potency."

The idea of the preparatory school has probably been more completely developed in England than in this country, and the names of Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Westminster, and Winchester are almost as famous as those of Oxford and Cambridge. Rugby is especially familiar to us, partly because of the remarkable character of Thomas Arnold, admirably portrayed by Dean Stanley, and partly because of the adventures of Tom Brown—known to every schoolboy and almost as real as the doctor himself. Worthy to be named with the story and the memoir are the verses of Matthew Arnold on Rugby chapel. "Through thee," the poet says of his father,

> "I believe
> In the noble and great who are gone;
> Pure souls, honored and blest
> By former ages . .
> Yes, I believe that there lived

Others like thee in the past;
Not like the men of the crowd
. . . .
But souls tempered with fire,
Fervent, heroic, and good—
Helpers and friends of mankind."

We know less about Mr. Edward Thring, the head-master of Uppington school, who died some years ago, but it is clear that he too was born to be a leader and teacher of boys. I have been acquainted in this country, intimately, with a kindred soul, an English schoolmaster, who, first in Trinity school of New York, then at Lake Mohegan, then in a college, and at length in a university, exercised over all the youth that knew him the strongest intellectual and moral influence. Long as they live his pupils will revere Charles d'Urban Morris. Such men are robust. Their virility is shown in bodily exercises, in scholarship, in politics, in religion. They quit themselves like men and are strong. Happy the land where they are engaged in the service of the boys!

Characters like those just mentioned have been developed in this country. I could name some who are living, beloved, honored, obeyed, and followed. Among the departed, Doctor Abbot of Exeter and Doctor Taylor of Andover are particularly worthy to be remembered. But on the whole, the tendency of our times is not toward the fostering of such teachers. Many of the brightest Americans are attracted by business. The three professions traditionally called learned, and the modern scientific pursuits, enlist great numbers. Of those who devote themselves to teaching, the most prefer to enter the service of the college or the university. Few only, so far as my acquaintance goes, seek permanent careers in the service of boys' schools; few declare that they will be satisfied with the opportunities and emoluments of a good and faithful teacher. Hence, one of the most delightful of intellectual pursuits, one of the most useful, one of the most honorable, one of the most sacred, is in danger of falling into the hands of inferior men. The only remedy that I can see is for the head-masters, trustees, and parents to be on the watch, and when a born teacher appears, engage him, reward him,

encourage him, retain him. See that his path is free from stones, that he is not overworked or harassed, and that he is kept contented in his lot. Let him be sure that as much respect and as much income will be his as would fall to his fortune were he to enter the pulpit or be called to the bar. Let it never be forgotten that the teacher's gifts are as rare as the poet's. The methods of education can make scholars, pedants, specialists, and a very narrow man may live in his den and benefit the world by patient observation and minute researches. But no process has been discovered for making teachers. They are like gems, that must be found, for they cannot be produced. I would rather place a schoolboy under one "all-round man," whose manners, morals, and intellectual ways were exemplary and who was capable of teaching him Homer and Euclid, than under a group of specialists selected simply as mathematicians, physicists, and linguists. Later on, when the character of a boy is established, when his habits are formed, when he knows how to study, when he has learned the art of acquiring knowledge and the graces of expression, let the specialists take hold of him. Even then let it be provided that the specialists shall not be too narrow. If possible, choose scientific men from the school of Agassiz, Henry, Bache, and Dana; and linguists from the school of Woolsey, Felton, Whitney, Drisler, and Gildersleeve—men who know *multa et multum*.

As to the curriculum of a preparatory school, this is not the place to measure its limits or its requisites, as they are virtually determined by the college authorities, not by the schoolmasters. If the colleges say that they will not admit as scholars those who fail to show a knowledge of certain prescribed studies, the preparatory school must teach those studies or must close its doors; there is no middle course. Boys are fitted for college in a preparatory school, or they are not—that is the only question. Nevertheless, I believe that the day is coming when there will be a revision of our educational creed, when the colleges will not make their entrance examinations such rigid tests of memory as they are now, but will contrive to make them tests of power. Is a boy capable of carrying forward the studies of the college?—that must be found out. His capacity to retain and repeat what

he has learned is one sign of his qualifications, but there are many others which a nicer analysis may employ. The qualitative test is quite as important as the quantitative. Not the size of the brain, but its structure, determines its worth. The possession of ten thousand facts may distinguish an idiot, but an idiot gives no proper emphasis; he does not perceive the difference between the trifling and the fundamental. Yet an extraordinary memory may also distinguish a scholar. Lord Macaulay, for example, was heard to say that if by some miracle of vandalism all copies of Paradise Lost and the Pilgrim's Progress were destroyed he would undertake to reproduce them both from recollection. A scholar holds his knowledge in well-arranged groups, under certain principles, under certain laws; he is constantly exercising his judgment, his discrimination, his reason. He knows where to lay the stress; he does not confound the essential with its accidents.

Whenever the time comes for a revision of the curriculum of the preparatory school, three subjects should receive much more attention than is now given to them. The study of science should be so pursued that the habit of close observation and of reasoning upon ascertained facts should at least be initiated. Nature should be approached by the schoolboy as a willing and ever-present teacher. Her lessons should be the delight of every adolescent. When we remember that in contemplating the heavens, in watching the life of plants and animals, in the observation of the modes of motion and in studying the inorganic world there are innumerable and infinitely varied opportunities to awaken curiosity, to train the eye and the hand, to exercise the judgment, to reward investigation—how strange that so little progress is made in the introduction of scientific studies in elementary education! Modern languages also, especially French and German, are nowadays indispensable in a liberal education; and they are much more readily acquired in childhood than in maturity. How are they to get just recognition in the preparatory schools? An acquaintance with the Bible should also be required of every schoolboy. College professors have lately been showing how ignorant the youth of America are of the history, the geography, the biography, and the literature of

the sacred books. I do not now refer to its religious lessons, but I speak of the Bible as a basis of our social fabric, as the embodiment of the most instructive human experiences, as a collection of poems, histories, precepts, laws, and examples, priceless in importance to the human race. These Scriptures have pervaded our literature. All this inheritance we possess in a version which is unique. Its marvellous diction, secured by the revisions of many centuries, and its substantial accuracy, the care of many generations of scholars, are beyond our praise. But how little study does the schoolboy give to this book in secular or sacred hours; how ignorant may he really be of that which is supposed to be his daily counsellor! Science, modern languages, and the Bible have been so long neglected in preparatory schools that it is extremely hard nowadays to find effective teachers for these subjects. There is no consensus as to books, no tradition respecting methods. Perhaps we are waiting for the waters to be disturbed by the angel of deliverance, but we shall wait in vain unless we put forth efforts of our own to reach the true remedies. The day will come for better things; we can see its approaches.

Meanwhile, it is just as well to remember that there is nothing sacred in our present curriculum. It is a method which generally produces good results, but it is no catholicon. Its defects are perceived by this generation, and the next will provide the remedies. Thus slowly move the wheels.

XXIII

HOW TO THINK

BY

EDWARD EVERETT HALE

CHAPLAIN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE of the most difficult moments that a youth faces in life is that in which, having graduated from some elementary school, he suddenly finds himself no longer under control. Instead of having certain well-regulated bits of information poured into him, he is free to acquire what he will, or to reject it all. Thinking is no longer done for him by learned teachers, he must think for himself. And by the quality of that thinking all his future life must stand or fall. It is at that perilous moment that a word of guidance may prove of infinite value. It is then that he should be familiar with the following address.

The Reverend Edward Everett Hale, D.D., LL.D., is not only one of the most widely known of American literary masters, but has also for many years held official rank as the Chaplain of the United States Senate. He may thus more than any other man be regarded as the official speaker for the religious faith of our country. The words of counsel which he offers, not only to youth but to older minds as well, are here combined with a valuable scientific analysis of the processes of thought.

IN a playful little poem by William Barnard, who was Dean of Derry a hundred and nine years ago, in answer to a challenge from Dr. Johnson, who had bidden him improve himself after he was forty-eight years old, he selects his teachers. Three of them are Sir William Jones, Adam Smith, Edmund Burke, and the fourth, Beauclerk. The lines are:

"Jones, teach me modesty and Greek;
Smith, how to think; Burke, how to speak;
And Beauclerk, to converse."

The man who should have Adam Smith as a teacher in the art of thinking would be fortunate, if the teacher could really bring his pupil near to his own level. And in the midst of the modern philosophizing, I will say to any quiet, intelligent person, who does not dislike common sense, that he will find the books of Jones to be good reading to-day.

Capel Lofft says, in his curious book on "Self-Formation," that the elder D'Israeli says that no person has ever written on the "Art of Meditation."

I have not been able to find the statement by D'Israeli; but Capel Lofft says that he has spent much time in verifying it, and he believes it to be true.[1]

He goes further and says that not one man in twenty ever does think; by which he means that very few men think to any purpose or with any system. I am afraid that this statement is true. Most of the people one meets in the world take their opinions ready-made from the newspapers or their neighbors or, in general, from the fashion.

There is indeed a habit, for which two causes could be found,

[1] Capel Lofft's book which I have cited above is called "Self-Formation, by a Fellow of a College." It has been reprinted in America, and will be found in the large libraries. It is a gossiping, entertaining book, professing to describe the "history of an individual mind," and has a good many practical hints, useful to young students. He is always talking of his great discovery, which to most people seems almost a mare's nest. Two pages, one in the first volume, one in the second, contain the whole of it. It amounts to this,—that in reading you should stop at the end of each sentence and "re-flect," turn back on the sentence, to be sure that you possess its meaning. What follows will be, he says, that you must go through it *at one breath*, or if it be an unusually long one, that you give one breath to every member of it. On this business of our breathing, *in time*, he lays great stress, as a good teacher of swimming would bid you breathe in proper time with your strokes. When, in the second volume, we come to the great secret of the book, it proves that we cannot think unless we think in time with our breathing. "I have already stated my conviction that the management of the breath is very important in conversation, in studious reading, and in oratory. I am just as thoroughly persuaded that this is true of meditation, that it governs in great degree the thinking faculty. . . ." "I despatched every sentence," as he thought it, "in a breath, and then, doubling the

of taking it for granted that men cannot control their thoughts. It is said squarely that the thoughts come or go wholly without the choice or power of the man. But this is not the theory of the great men, of the real leaders. They bid us control our thoughts, that is, to learn to think, just as we control any other appetites. Paul tells us what we are to think of,[1] and he goes on to the other matter, which is more dangerous, and tells us what we are not to think of. There are things which are not even to be spoken of, and with an allowable paradox, Paul tells what they are. It is only writers of a lower grade who seem to take for granted that you must let thoughts go or come at their reckless pleasure or by the mere chance of what may be the condition of the circulation of blood upon the brain. Such writers, if they were pressed, would have to say that you are not to undertake any control of bodily appetites, any more than you undertake the control of mental processes.

But the truth is that Man is master of mind, and master of body, if he WILL. This is the privilege of a child of God, and a true man asserts his empire and uses it. I do not say he can begin all of a sudden in such control, if he had never used it before. But he can learn how to gain such control. He can have more to-day than he had last Tuesday, and he can

blow,—a second idea having flowed into the interval of vacuity,—I applied myself to it in the same way, and so proceeded through the series."

It is evident that Lofft had never read Swedenborg. If he had, he would have cited the *Arcana Celestia*. "The reason," says Swedenborg, "why life is described in Genesis ii. 7, by *breathing* and *breath* is because the men of the most ancient church perceived states, of law and of faith by states of *respiration*. . . . Concerning this respiration nothing can yet be said, inasmuch as it is a subject at this day altogether unknown; nevertheless, the most ancient people (those before the flood) had a perfect knowledge of it"; and Swedenborg refers to the same subject in page 1, 119, in the tenth book, of the *Arcana*. I think that Swedenborg was here referring, consciously or unconsciously, to Abraham Tucker (Ned Search) where he describes the method of intercommunication of souls in their "spiritual bodies."

[1] Ephesians v. 3–12.

have more next Tuesday than he has to-day. This is what is meant by learning to think. Thus a man may train his memory to do better work for him this year than it did last year. True, when the body begins to fail, the memory may begin to fail in its mechanical processes, but none the less shall that man find that the eternal realities of past life are his. Thus it will happen that a man tells you that he cannot remember, when he has never taught himself to perceive, or to observe.

Mr. Ruskin goes so far as to say that all which we call genius for fine art is simply an admirable memory. He constantly recurs to this. Claude Lorraine and Turner paint the sky well; for they well remember what they have seen. It seems certain that the faculties even of the observation of color may be improved by exercise. Any foreman in a dry-goods shop will tell us how fast the boys improve in their study of color; and it is well known to oculists that women, because they have been trained for generations in matching colors, have become more precise in this business than men are. It occurs to me, as I write, that one of the most brilliant and successful colorists I know among American artists began life in a dry-goods shop. What drudgery he thought it then! And has he perhaps lived to think that drudgery a blessing?[1]

We begin then, as we always begin, by demanding determination; the will must act, and act imperiously. "I will think on this subject." This implies what the writers call concentration; just as we found that in putting himself to sleep a man must make sleep his whole business,—first, second, and last, he must devote himself to sleep,—so now he must devote himself to thinking on this one subject and on no other. There is a great advantage in the training of our public schools. Boys and girls learn to study without attending to the work of the school-room; or if they do not they throw away a great opportunity. You ought to be able early in life so to concentrate thought that in a railway carriage you can close your eyes, take up a subject of thought, and hold to it for a reasonable time, perhaps till you have done with it. At all events you ought to be able to lay by the subject for future reference, ticketed,

[1] The reference is to Mr. Bradford, the painter of Arctic pictures.

so that you may know how far you have advanced with it and where you are to begin another time.

You determine, for instance, to think about a protective tariff. How much do I know of it and where am I ignorant? What are the foundations of my knowledge? How sure are they, and where can I improve on them? Now what follows clearly and surely on the premises? What is more doubtful, and how can I solve such doubt?

I do not believe that it is well to hold on long at a time upon the same topic. I think it is better to take a subject to a certain point, then to ticket it, as I say, and lay it by prepared to take it up again. But when you take it up again do not begin at the old beginning and go over the old ground. Take what you have done for granted, and from the point where you are go forward.

In this matter, as in all other matters where will is involved, there comes in the necessity of energy. Capel Lofft, if you will look up his book, has a great deal to say about this, and goes back to the derivations of the Greek words. But it ought to be enough to say that you cannot think well unless you think with all your might. You cannot think lazily. You cannot think if you are half-hearted about it. You must somehow take interest enough in your work to follow it at the moment as if it were the only thing. Unless you work with your whole heart, the work cannot be wholly done.

Without going further into detail, I must say something as to the necessity of the business in hand, and I will take the three departments of mental activity which we call memory, imagination, and argument, or reasoning. Although as old age comes on the mechanical processes of memory may give way, a man who has trained his memory will feel himself sure all the same of the external realities of his life, though he may not be able to recall the letters of their names. So a man may train and enlarge his powers of imagination. Nay, he must, if he is to make any considerable advance in the larger life. Full one half of men's failures are due to their lack of imagination, or to their neglect to use imagination at the right time and in the right way. Once more, every man who is rightly and

wisely to do his duty in the world among his fellows must train his power of argument. He must not stand by, helpless, when some wordy fool on a platform makes the worse appear the better reason. Memory, imagination, reasoning, then, are for us three good examples of the great necessity in which we must exercise our power. Of these three duties I will speak a little more in detail, not dwelling on what a man may do in training his perceptions, his power of concentration, his power of statement or of conversation, and a hundred other faculties which come under the general statement that the man is to be master of the mind.

First, then, as to memory.[1] Had one no other reason for training memory carefully, and keeping it in hand, here is the supreme reason: that one must keep ready at every instant of trial the determinations made in the moments of reflection. As I am always saying, Wordsworth defines the hero as he

> "Who in the heat of conflict keeps the Law
> In calmness made,—and sees what he foresaw."

The little child untrained comes to his mother in grief because he has done wrong, and makes, probably, the true excuse, as he sobs out that he did not remember. The trained man, trampling temptation under foot, does remember. He remembers his resolution, and this re-enforces will. There is an interesting thought in the mere etymology of our word "conscience." "Conscience" is a Latin word, which means the knowledge all at once of all the elements involved. If my conscience is quick and strong, I know at once, and that once is now, all that I can know of this temptation. I know to what ruin it brings me; I know by what methods I can quench its fire; I know how to put my foot upon its head and the point of my sword at its throat. I know all this now.

[1] I have not dared go into the systems of what is called artificial memory. The best by far, I think, is in Gouraud's book, published with a good deal of fuss and feathers in New York over forty years ago. Gouraud remembered everything so perfectly that we used to call him "the Wandering Jew."

All these systems depend on using the stronger side of memory, whatever it is, to re-enforce the weaker.

"*Conscire*" is the Latin verb; to know at once the perceptions of the outward senses, the lessons of old experience, and the present verdict of the man within.

Charlotte Brontë refers to this necessity in that central passage, where she describes her heroine's conquest of immediate temptation.

"Laws and principles are not for the times when there is no temptation; they are for such moments as this, when body and soul rise in mutiny against their rigor. Stringent are they, inviolate they shall be. If, at my individual convenience I might break them, what would be their worth? They have a worth—so I have always believed; and if I cannot believe it now, it is because I am insane—quite insane; with my veins running fire, and my heart beating faster than I can count its throbs. Conscience and reason are turned traitors against me, and are charging me with crime. They speak as loud as feeling in its clamors. Preconceived opinions, foregone determinations are all I have at this hour to stand by."

But we need not go to poetry or fiction for our examples. The little child of whom I spoke comes to his mother, crying, and can only offer the apology that "he did not remember" that she had bidden him keep away from the stove. If his hand be not very badly burnt, she will not be very sorry; because she now knows that he will remember better another time. Indeed, what Mr. Ruskin says of fine art, we may say of life. That all the training by which God is gradually changing us from babies into archangels is but so much accumulation by memory, more or less completely educated.

But this training of memory and this knowledge at one and the same time of the cause and consequence of the present temptation involve the right use of the imagination. The larger life, indeed, which is the purpose and object for which we live every day, requires me to command and control my imagination, to use it on the right errands, and to refuse it when it would fain travel the wrong way. The world in which I live may be the cell of a wretched prison, cabined and confined as was the unfortunate dauphin, the son of Louis XVI., or as Kaspar Hauser was said to be, so that his prison walls touched

him above, below, on the right hand and on the left, behind and before.

One is really almost as badly off as he is when he is in a crowded railway car after darkness has come on. I cannot talk to my next neighbor because he is a Moqui Indian, I can see nothing but the shadows from the smoking lamp, I can hear nothing but the clatter of the rail. This is hard circumstance. But what is circumstance to a trained child of God living by the divine order? I ought to be able to bid Shakespeare meet with Milton there. I may call Charles Dickens and Walter Scott into the interview. I may select the subject on which they shall talk, I may bid them say their say, and I may send them on their way. I may summon here all whom I have loved most in literature, be they people who have lived and breathed, or be they people who never had form or weight or visible body: such people as Jane Eyre or Di Vernon or Rosalind. I have them and they cannot leave me. The dead nausea of the disgusting car is forgotten, and in that prison cell I have enlarged my life to journey as I will.

I recall that Mme. de Genlis, in her gossiping and entertaining memoirs, goes at length into her habit of creating for herself an imaginary society. The passage is worth the search of enterprising readers, though I am afraid the book has neither index nor contents.[1]

Now for the same reason and for the larger life which all along we are seeking, you must train the faculty of reasoning, that you may have an opinion, and that opinion your own. To look on both sides and choose the better side, to dissect the rhetoric of a demagogue, to strip off his coat of many colors, and to show him for what he is, to decide between rival plans and to determine one's aim, for one's own purposes, by one's own abilities, —all this is the duty of a man. Without this he forfeits a man's privilege. He is a chip on the current, whirled down in this flood, whirled up in that eddy, or left stagnant in some standing pool. How often, alas, one meets a man who never knew the

[1] All that is said on the cultivation of the imagination shows the importance of giving to children enough fairy-tales and enough poetry with which to amuse themselves.

luxury of an opinion. He has taken his morning impression from one newspaper, his evening impression from another. Meanwhile he has been the tool and the fool of every person who chose to use him, or to tell him what to think and what to say. To keep clear of that vacancy of life, a true man cares diligently, lovingly, for the weapons which have been given him, weapons of defence—yes, and sometimes weapons of attack, if need may be. He learns how to reason, how to search for truth, how to question nature, how to interpret her answers. He learns how to arrange in right order such eternal truths and such visible facts as relate to the matter he has in hand. He clears and enlarges his power of reasoning.

The power of induction and deduction man has because he is a child of God. It is the faculty which distinguishes him from the brutes. A body of wolves in the Pyrenees may gather round the fire which a peasant has left, and will enjoy the warmth of the embers. A group of chattering monkeys on the rock of Gibraltar might gather so round the watchfire which an English sentinel had left burning. They can enjoy the heat; but they cannot renew the fire. They cannot work out the deduction which is necessary before one kicks back upon the glaring embers the black brand which has rolled away. Were it to save their lives, they must freeze before one of them can deduce from what he sees the law or the truth as to what he must do. Here is it that man differs from the brute. He can learn. He can follow a deduction. He can argue. He can rise, step by step, to higher life.

This he does when he takes the control of thought. He rises to a higher plane and lives in a larger life.[1]

There is no neater or better illustration of the way in which a wise teacher draws out the thinking faculty of a child than that which Warren Colburn borrowed, from Miss Edgeworth,

[1] All that is said on the culture of the thinking faculty is to be remembered, seriously, by teachers who are in any danger of using text-books too much. The text-book, as an authority, injures the child's power to think. Make him work out the rule for himself,—if you can. That means, probably, if you know how to think yourself.

I believe, to place in the beginning of that matchless oral arithmetic which still holds its place in many well-regulated schools. The advantage which the thinking faculty gains from good training in mathematics cannot be overstated. A master in that business[1] used to say to me that, when you meet a man who says that he has no mathematical faculty, he is simply a man who was not well taught his "vulgar fractions" or his "rule of three" in childhood. I am inclined to think that this is true. A thousand writers have been eager to prove that good grammatical work does the same thing—and I believe that they are right. It is just the same mental process by which I build up a Latin verb, pronoun, and noun, so that they shall express the fact that "George Washington had taken off his own hat before he met Henry Knox," as the process by which I work out the truth that seventy-two apples costing nine cents a dozen may be exchanged for two pecks of walnuts costing three cents and three-eighths a quart. Why the parallel of the two studies of language and mathematics as mental gymnastics should have been so much belabored as it has been, I have never known.

This is certain, that no one learns to think without thinking. I believe we may say more. I believe he must make a business of thinking. He must take hold of the control of his thought intentionally, resolutely, and energetically. If he does this I believe he will think more clearly, and with better results next year than he does to-day.

[1] Nathan Hale, Jr.

XXIV

THE GIRL

"THE THING TO DO"

BY

WHITELAW REID

UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO ENGLAND

AS girl and boy approach maturity their paths diverge. They can no longer be classed under a common name as "children" and dealt with under similar rules. As man and woman they become beings of differing aims, differing thoughts, and differing capacities. Hence come two sets of problems instead of one, and the complexity of modern life is doubled, the difficulty of grasping at its meaning and its outcome is immeasurably increased. To talk about the future of "the race" as a whole, as though men and women were a unit striving toward a common goal, is to ignore an entire group of antagonisms as obvious as life itself.

The more direct problems involved in the question of sex we have already treated; but now, looking along the line of youthful education, we reach the moment when it is finished—so far as schools can finish education—and the girl, the young woman approaching maturity, looks out upon a wider life. She asks herself, demands of her own intelligent and well-developed mind, the question, "What next?" "To what course of drifting or of effort shall I seriously devote myself until death ends the story?"

It is some sort of answer to this momentous question that Mr. Reid here offers. As one who has long ranked among the commanding journalists of our land, as a leader in educational advancement, and as a statesman known to all Europe as well as to his home, Mr. Reid has certainly earned the right to speak and to be heard with earnest thought. The present address,

delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Vassar College at the time of the young ladies' graduation, is here published by his permission and with his approval.

THE brilliant President of a great California university has defined Wisdom as "Knowing What to do Next," and Virtue as "Doing it." Responding to the call with which the young ladies of the Phi Beta Kappa have honored me, I shall try to merit your attention by speaking to you for a little of "The Thing to Do." In proportion then to any success in saying the right word to you on this subject, that word must come, however unworthy the voice through which it speaks, as the counsel of Wisdom and the command of Virtue.

The universal inquiry in the graduating class on Commencement Day is, What next? The mere man has no monopoly of it. The girl graduate, too, is absorbed in questions about what shall she do. Misty visions float before her eyes. Now as always the vague outlines are apt to shape themselves to the first gaze, alike of the simplest and of the wisest, into happy homes and home responsibilities. But in these days of broader horizons, many another purpose in life comes in to enlarge or to confuse the picture. Whether with the home or without a home, comes the thought of a career worthy of the capacities here discovered, the training here given; perhaps a literary, or artistic, or scientific career, perhaps educational or professional, perhaps reformatory, perhaps social; but always a career, always the desire for a field in which to exercise the proper power of the trained abilities and enjoy their rightful influence, always the resolve to do something. Let us first see now if there is not one especial thing which, in any career and whatever else may or may not be done, it is the duty of every girl graduate to attempt, in her respective sphere and to the full measure of her capacity.

It was sixty-five years ago that a singularly acute French observer pronounced the legal profession the most conservative element in this country and the greatest safeguard against the excesses, as he called them, of democracy. But the interven-

ing two-thirds of a century have shown many changes. We have seen no political craze, from secession to the payment of national debts in fiat money or in silver, no popular delusion, from spirit portraits to communism or to the right of some laborers to prohibit free labor, that has not been led by lawyers; and we have seen no depth of degradation to which, in pursuit of a fee, some members of this profession have not descended, and that, too often, without incurring the active repudiation of the majority.

Perhaps the dangerous tendencies in America of which De Tocqueville spoke are at the present time "the excesses of democracy"; though, perhaps again, they may be merely the general tendencies of the age, exhibited here a little earlier, or more freely, because of the liberty of faction democracy affords. At any rate, there has never been a day in the history of the country when such a restraining influence as he attributed to the lawyers was so much needed as at present. Meanwhile the legal profession, through a not inconsiderable number of its members, has developed into one of the active means, not for restraining, but for actually furthering the excesses; and, as a whole, it certainly exerts now a less conservative and restraining influence than was gratefully recognized in our earlier history.

When John Stuart Mill taught, in a little book less talked about now than his later publications, that women made contributions to the sum of human knowledge and consequent progress as important as those coming from men, though different in kind, being apt to be intuitional rather than logical, he may have furnished a hint as to the real safeguard against social disorders that in his time were hardly known. If the conservative influence which is hereafter to protect us from the excesses either of democracy or of the spirit of the age is no longer to be surely and always found in the old quarter, it may still prove that we can turn for it to a class with higher inspirations and keener moral perceptions, to a class with deeper interest in the outcome, and capable of unquestionably greater influence, whenever aroused to exercise it. It may prove, in fact, that we can look to the educated women of the country

rather than to its lawyers for the true conservatism in principle, in methods, and in constant application that is to save us from many of the most dangerous tendencies of the time. Hope, then, will not be lost for the future of our triumphant democracy till their characteristic excellences are corrupted or destroyed.

The reasons for such an expectation lie in human nature itself, and in that female ability which Mr. Mill demonstrated for such contributions to human knowledge and progress. All the instincts of the educated woman are toward good order and good morals and good life; all her interests are against rash experiments and revolutionary changes; the character alike of her judgment, her feelings, and her needs gives promise of sound and sane views of life and of human conduct. Both by inherent qualities and by acquired relations the rightly educated woman is a natural and necessary conservative. With her mental alertness and vivid perceptions she can never be a drag upon the machinery of human progress, but, thanks to her special aptitudes, she may always be its moderator and its governor.

This at least is clear, that the twentieth-century woman has greater opportunities than were ever given to a human creature of her kind before, in the eighty centuries of the world's history of which we are supposed to have some records; that she has been better prepared to improve them, and that she is more peremptorily called to the work—this twentieth-century woman, to whom have been given the keys of knowledge which are becoming almost the keys of life and death. The ferment and amazing discovery and development of the nineteenth century did not end when it closed; they could be but the hot-bed for starting the prodigious, myriad-formed, almost infinite growths to be confidently expected in the twentieth. If, in the midst of these teeming and steaming activities, woman now possesses the real power which Mr. Mill attributed to her, then the imperative duty which her superior moral elevation, her nature, and her surroundings impose, for the whole term of her existence and throughout the whole course of our bewildering progress, is to furnish this conservative force in American life

which two-thirds of a century ago De Tocqueville thought already necessary. Her wisdom will point it out as a thing to do next, her virtue will shine in doing it. Thus the subject to which I have ventured to invite your attention, "The Thing to Do," arises before you, attends your incoming and your outgoing, and henceforth forever entreats and commands you.

Of specific excesses toward which our democratic institutions seem to be tending perhaps we do not need to speak in any great detail. It may be enough to recognize that the American who colonized the Atlantic coast and the great Middle West, who framed the Constitution, started the Government, developed the country under it, and fought a gigantic Civil War to preserve it, is not the American who leads the popular movements of to-day. The type is changing; the beliefs are changing, and the aims.

He is neither Puritan any longer, nor Cavalier. He may outwardly deny the decay of faith, but he inwardly feels it. Nothing is more noticeable at the great centres of population and of national activity, or in any large section of what calls itself, and is often called, our best society, than this disappearance of the old foundation of character and action; this loss of profound, enduring, restful faith in anything. It is a *laissez-aller* age; an age of loosening anchors and drifting with the tide; of taking things as they are, with cordial readiness to take them hereafter as they come; of an easy indifference, whose universal attitude toward each startling departure from old standards is "What does it matter, anyway?"—an age, in short, marked by a refined, "up-to-date" adaptation of the old Epicurean idea that there is nothing in this world to do but to eat and drink and make merry, for to-morrow we die. As Omar, prime favorite of the flower of this new school, has sung:

> What boots it to repeat
> How time is slipping underneath our feet;
> Unborn Tomorrow, and dead Yesterday,
> Why fret about them if To-day be sweet!

The loss of faith brings us by a short cut straight to the loss of purpose in life—of any purpose at least beyond purely material ones. To those who need money, the duty of getting it first, and above anything else, becomes the gospel of life. To those who feel the need of position, whether in society, business, or elsewhere, their gospel drives them to all means within the law to attain them. To those who have both money and position comes the only remaining purpose in life, that of using them for an existence of amusement and enjoyment. Is it too much to say that never before in our history have such aspirations so completely dominated and limited such large classes?

But this craze for mere amusement and enjoyment, like other perverted appetites, grows by what it feeds on. The amusement soon becomes wearisome, the enjoyment soon palls unless constantly more and more spectacular and bizarre. Perpetual change and constantly increasing variety of extremes seem to be the ever rising price of keeping amused. One never is for long where one wants to be, or doing what one desires; there must be incessantly a rushing to and fro, and a change of pursuit, all under the glare of electric lights and the blare of brass bands. If in the country, one must hasten to the city where something is going on; if in the city, one must fly to the country where the crowd is not so mixed, and where pleasanter house-parties can be gathered; if in one's own land, one longs for the boulevards or the Alps; if abroad, one is eager to try the new steamer back; if at the seashore, one wants suddenly to know what the mountains are like, and can only find amusement in going to see when clothed in leather jackets, protected by masks and goggles, and powdered with dirt, rushing through the dusty air on the highways at forty or fifty miles an hour in a Red Devil, and leaving the luckless rustics in the way to go to a fiend of any color they like.

Even then this vehement vacuity is not amusing unless it is talked about. One must be forever before the footlights and, if possible, in the centre of the stage. Privacy is deadly dulness. Not to have your name every other day in the newspapers,

and especially in the most hopelessly vulgar and inane of the newspaper columns, the so-called social ones, is to be out of the world, to be bored to death. Not to see every intimate fact about yourself or your friends thrust naked and shameless under the public eye is to feel that you are dropping out of the swim. If there is a steamer that has raced across the Atlantic in fifteen minutes less than any other, you suddenly realize that nothing is going on here, and you must immediately cross back on that steamer. If there is a White Ghost that has flitted over crowded country roads half a mile an hour faster than the last Red Devil, and has caused more runaways and killed one or two more people, you will be leading a very dull life till you have gone faster in that same, or in some better and uglier machine, and have left a wider swath of disaster and terror behind you. Even then the amusement is stale unless the papers tell you that you broke the record, if not somebody's neck also, print your portrait, and mention who your grandfather was, by way of showing how proud the presumably worthy old man ought to be of his hopeful, goggle-eyed descendant.

Gregariousness and glare are the irredeemably vulgar notes of it all. To seek enjoyment within yourself and your own circle, in resources of your own, and without a fresh flash-light picture every day, becomes unendurable. A country residence is impossible unless a dozen others, "of our own set, you know," are within five minutes' call; and even then it is slow without a thronged race-track at hand. Thus Newport, rather than Biltmore, becomes the veneered and shiny national type for those who can, at will, command either. As for the babes that must struggle through childhood into precocious maturity in such surroundings, why, they are to live in this world, aren't they—not in the happy Valley of Rasselas? Why shouldn't they get on, without rest and real country life, as well as their parents?

If loss of faith and loss of purpose have led to such changes from the decorous, albeit a little provincial, society of a hundred years ago, what transformations may not be expected from the same influences in our political life? Already we begin

to note the same fever for variety and unreasoning change. We know now how Aristides was banished because the citizens were tired of hearing him called the just; we have more than once given in modern phrases the same old Greek reason for our own banishments. "Oh, well! they've been in long enough; let's try a change." The steady persistence in policy of the fathers and founders of the Republic seems disappearing; and the political characteristics displayed are becoming noticeably less English, and even less Northern. "You are as fickle as the French, and as fond of sudden excitements," is a criticism of overcandid observers from the north of Europe, which we hear with increasing frequency; and it must be confessed that of late we do show, oftener than could be desired, sudden and irresponsible popular movements which we are apt to look for in the Latin rather than the Northern races. A wave of excitement sweeps over the country and throughout whole communities the very best and most conscientious of our people are stampeded with sudden fear of European domination, and alarm about the Pope of Rome, if we do not hurriedly erect legislative dams against foreign invasions on our eastern shores. The Know Nothings had a close race with the Free Soilers for first place, and for a time were ahead—seeming actually about to succeed in making hostility to the foreigner rather than sympathy with the slave the shibboleth of the new national party. Within my own experience, a distinguished official and highly honored citizen of New York has vehemently arraigned me for neglect of duty, in my own modest sphere, in not trying to arouse people against the peril to our liberties and the alarming violation of the Constitution of the United States involved in the creation of a foreign prince in this country—in the person of Cardinal Gibbons! But presently the wind is blowing from exactly the opposite quarter; sympathy for the sweet Emerald Isle in turn overpowers us; we raise money by the hundred thousand dollars, are hardly dissuaded from raising volunteers also for the Fenian army, and shout ourselves hoarse in pecuniary and rhetorical efforts to force on a friendly nation an acceptance of the solution *we* think best for her most perplexing domestic problem. Next a sudden fear of Asiatic com-

petition stampedes us; and we instantly abandon, as to Orientals at least, our old boast that our land is the home of the oppressed of every clime, the land of opportunity for all who would better their condition. Straightway Congress is busy building dams on our western coast to keep the wave of slant-eyed invaders out, while our people rush into excesses against those who are in, reaching sometimes to riot, but more often merely to such refinements of cruelty as cutting off their pigtails or burning down their joss-houses.

A cry that the money that was good enough for us should be good enough for our foreign debtors carries half the people captive; a great national convention comes near nominating the chief advocate of this notion for the presidency, and the country is on the verge of paying the national debt in greenbacks. A few years later, a rather cheap rhetorician catches the fancy of an excited assemblage by talking about crucifying the people on a cross of gold, and straightway there sweeps over the land like a prarie fire a wave of excitement for persuading water to flow uphill, and silver to be as good as gold without the advice or consent of any other nation on earth. Next we plunge into municipal affairs; give away priceless franchises because we are in such a hurry we can't take time to see what they are worth; borrow till we have exhausted the limit, and then mark up the value of our property in order to be able to borrow more upon it, and chuckle over every fresh million of debt incurred, as if this were the end of that trouble. We turn out a reform administration for not reforming fast enough, and instal Croker and Tammany to improve the job. We grumble that the town has been too straitlaced, rejoice that at last it is blissfully wide open, then wake up to find it intolerably wide open, and once more put in a reformer, finally threatening to turn him out again because everybody that voted for him hasn't in the first year got everything he wanted.

For a long time we itch to interfere in Spain's trouble with her colony, and at last in a white heat over the explosion of a naval vessel we do rush into war, but not before being caught in the ebb of the same tide and swept by it into the sentimental declaration that we will never, no, never, permit our country

to reap from this expenditure of its money and its young life such security and advantage as every other nation which ventures on the solemn sacrifice of the treasure and blood of its people has felt bound to require from the beginning of time, and *was* bound to require. Next the whole country is up in arms in another gush of sentiment to protest that instantly, without safeguards of any sort, a little island off in the Atlantic, more than a fourth of the way over to Africa, must be given admission at once to all the rights and privileges of American citizenship. Presently the sentimental wave turns the other way, and another island, nearer, larger, vastly more important, with vastly greater claims, over which we have asserted a species of protectorate for three-quarters of a century, and which we profess to be tenderly guiding into the family of nations, is kept waiting for months and years for help, long since acknowledged to be our plain duty. Far from being a mother to this suffering orphan, whom we have ourselves dragged to our door and dropped helpless there, we are exhibiting a capacity, colossal as our strength, for being a stepmother.

Next we forget all about these burning issues, put them behind us as if they had never existed, and plunge pell-mell, clergy, editors, laity, and all classes and conditions of men, into a race with the politicians for the favor and the political influence of the downtrodden contract coal-miners, who were only getting three dollars a day, and had proclaimed against free labor in a so-called free country lest competition might require them to work a little more than five or six hours a day, and make coal cheaper for the multitude. Thus between our own meddling, and the dull inactivity of the employers, idly dreaming that it will soon blow over, we prolong the industrial paralysis till winter is at hand, and the President himself is forced to intervene in an unprecedented way to save us from a national calamity.

One day we go wild over a guest because he is the brother of an Emperor; the next we are in a pet because the same Emperor wants to collect money from an unwilling debtor, who doesn't pay his debts to us either. One day we proclaim Russia as our dearest friend, and fret with but half-concealed

contempt at Chinese complaints about the massacre of their countrymen in Wyoming, or Italian complaints about similar atrocities in Louisiana, or foreign comment generally on our burning of negroes at the stake; and the next day we are demanding that our Government shall at once and officially serve peremptory notice on that same dearest friend at St. Petersburg that we won't stand *his* equally wicked persecution of Jews in Kishineff in the heart of Russia. We are bent on an isthmus canal at Nicaragua, and can hardly keep our hands off our ancient ally for attempting one at Panama; we laugh loud and long at the De Lesseps collapse as proof of all we have said about the utter impracticability of the Panama route, then suddenly turn around, buy up the bankrupt, abandon the Nicaragua concern, and set out to finish that same impracticable and preposterous Panama scheme ourselves.

Thus wave after wave of half-considered opinion sweeps over the country; we flash into flames of sudden excitement, which fortunately, for the most part, die out like heat-lightning; feel equally fit to flout all the world's experience, solve at sight all its problems, or fight all creation at the drop of a hat, and are always in danger of going off at half-cock into a new party or out of it, into some untried policy or out of it, into some monstrous injustice or out of it, into war or out of it.

A graver change, amounting to a distinct degeneration in the average American character, may be a further consequence, and is at any rate a further accompaniment of the tendency to loss of faith and loss of purpose. It is the extravagant notion, never held in the days of the Fathers, that this is a land of equality, and that one man is as good as another. It has never been a land of equality, and one man never has been as good as another, and never will be, in this country or any other, in this life or any other—till the just God turns unjust and the creature that does ill becomes in His eyes as the creature that does well.

What is true, and it is the shining glory of the Fathers to have established it, is that this is a land where all men are on a par just once in their lives, for they have an equal start. Each man is guaranteed certain fundamental essentials at the

starting post—his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in his own way, so long as he respects the corresponding rights of others. Beyond that it is a fair field and no favor; and from the very moment of the equal start some draw ahead and others lag behind. The equality has disappeared like the morning mist; the inequality that lasts to the end, and is greater here than anywhere else in the world, is the inspiring fruitage of those blessed republican institutions under which no man can be too low to rise to the top, if he is fit for it.

But the delusion of equality remains and poisons. The laggard declares he is just as good as the man that has outstripped him, and that he is the victim of a monstrous injustice in being left behind. The spendthrift finds it iniquitous, since one man is as good as another, that he should be poor and needy, while the frugal and careful neighbor that started on an equal level with him is free from want. The idler swaggers up to his employer with the declaration that, since one man is as good as another, it is an imposition to pay him any less than the industrious workman at his side, and that he has a trades union at hand to prove and maintain it by a logic you can't resist. One man is as good as another, and therefore it is such an outrage to deprive a man of his vote merely because he has been a thief or a murderer that the governor must pardon him before the expiration of his term in the penitentiary, in order that the cloud on his free and independent American citizenship may be removed, and he may resume his rightful share in the business of governing the country.

This temper soon carries the false doctrine of equality one step further. It comes next that since one man is just as good as another, if the other doesn't think so he must be made to. In fact, if he does not agree with the devotees of the doctrine at a time when they have started out to enforce it on their employer, or on their associates, or on the community, he will do well to seek liberty to earn his living in some land of despotism—the home of the free is no place for him and is full of danger. The Walking Delegate is just about as obliging as the traditional foreman of the fire engine who said, "You may paint de machine any color you please, s'long's

you paint it red." You may do as you like in this land of liberty, so long as you do what our Union tells you.

But let us be fair to the laboring-man, and even to his misrepresentative, the Walking Delegate. This American intolerance of dissent is not confined to the Trades Union. The powerful trust may be just as exacting and intolerant till its demands have once been successfully challenged; and it has not at times been bashful about making these demands on legislatures, on the courts, even on the highest departments of the Government, and on national candidates. It is thought to be not bashful at this moment in Wall Street about making them upon the inevitable candidates of the party in power. The party machine has been accused of the same intolerance of dissent; doctors and lawyers and bankers have small room for the inconsiderate man who dares differ from what for the moment are thought essentials by the temporary or local majority; the tolerance of dissent has even been said to have reached into the Church.

An acute observer has traced the turbulence of French history since the days of Mirabeau to a lop-sided belief in their Trinity, Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité. The controlling masses, he said, cared very little for Liberté and hardly more for Fraternité, but had a consuming, vitriolic appetite for Egalité. And so it came about that equality under the Emperor, First or Third, was better than liberty under the Citizen-King or under the Republic.

Our doctrine that one man is just as good as another is carried farther still by its devotees: he is more than as good, he is better; or as the emancipated negroes loved to declaim in those deplorable reconstruction days, "De bottom rail's on top, bress de Lawd." So now it sometimes appears that if any man has the admitted power to rule it is the ignorant man, the idle man, the vicious man. To him nearly every worldly wise person seems to think it prudent to kowtow; while the other kind must obey or else be clubbed or dynamited into submission.

In such circumstances as we have been describing, mere noise, clamor, tumult, vociferous demand, becomes a social and

political force of the first magnitude. Under its impulse the soberest and best elements of the community are not infrequently swept into hasty conclusions which are afterward repented at leisure. Such, to take one single example out of many, was the sudden conversion of nearly everybody to the notion that arbitration is the most certain road to justice. Far be it from me to question or depreciate the admirable workings of this beneficent device, when both sides fairly enter into it, in fields to which it is adapted. But the sudden conversion I speak of is to the notion that it is in every sudden need always better than the courts and a cure-all for every ill. In consequence of the general unhesitating acceptance of this notion, if one side to a dispute is ready and eager for arbitration, the other is vehemently censured if it in turn hesitates for an instant at swallowing the nostrum.

The old machinery of justice must be set aside; the time-honored tribunals for the protection of individual rights and the adjustment of conflicting interests between man and man, gradually evolved through long centuries of Anglo-Saxon development, are pronounced too slow, and too costly, and too uncertain; the safe and sure thing is to compel—for nothing short of compulsion will satisfy these sudden converts—to compel both sides to appear before a new tribunal which can decide off-hand, unhampered by rules of procedure or technicalities of law, according to intuition and sense and feeling. And so the man that balks at arbitration has lost his case already before the bar of that Public Opinion which rules the country.

Who does not see, then, the special advantage this up-to-date contrivance for producing quick justice may often give the less deserving side? When the Walking Delegate, that new and powerful Peer of the Realm, hasn't been doing much for a week to convince his society that he is earning its pay, he has only to invent some new demand for shorter hours, or more frequent shifts, or fewer bricks in the hod, and when it is denied promptly calls for an arbitration. Now the essence of an arbitration, the only object of an arbitration, is to settle the thing, settle it quick, and make people contented again. But how can

they be contented unless they get at least some part of what they claim? In ordinary disputes between individuals or classes an arbitration that didn't give something to both sides would be almost unheard of. An arbitration that doesn't more or less "split the difference" would be unusual. So the natural end of it is that the Walking Delegate gains the approval of his people and strengthens his position by showing that he has earned his salary; his society gains something out of the demand, where, till he invented it, nothing had been expected or wanted or thought of; and the employer gains—well, he gains a settlement for the time being any way, till the Walking Delegate thinks of something else.

Exactly the same results may be expected when an employer, being in the wrong in a dispute with his workmen, induces them to consent to an arbitration, excepting that then you have another influence coming in to modify the outcome—the instinctive sympathy all right-minded men feel for the weaker side in a controversy. Very nearly the same results may be expected when, among contending capitalists, the one who is getting and deserves the worst of it calls for an arbitration. Very nearly the same may be expected when a nation that sets up and adheres long enough to a preposterous boundary claim calls for an arbitration—unless, indeed, as in a recent case, the nation in the right is wise enough to get exactly half of the "arbitrators"! otherwise the unreasonable claimant can never be worse off than before, and the chances are in favor of his gaining at least something. No wonder arbitration, with all its recognized merits and its beneficent successes, has come to be held at a premium by the side that is in the wrong! Starting with nothing, that side must generally come out with something, anyway, to the good! For the side that is in the wrong, therefore, the game is worth trying.

Here I must bring to a close these too prolix illustrations of the changing temper and practice of our people, as we have been drifting out of sight of those old American safeguards of Faith and Purpose. But let no hearer for one moment forget that there is another side to the picture. Admitting all faults

and inconsistencies and hysterical alternations of heat and cold, our people are still the freest, most generous, most capable, most active and daring; our country is still in our eyes the best the sun shines on. But we should be less its admirers, less loyal and less useful as its citizens, if we did not face the known facts with open eyes. Remember, too, that what we see is but in the dawn of our new century, and before our entire national existence has yet anywhere near reached the span the Psalmist assigned for two human lives. When we get a little nearer national maturity, and when the gigantic forces of the Twentieth Century are really under full headway, where is all that incessant, restless fever of change to lead? When the physical and moral whirl in which our national character is taking shape becomes still greater; when the marvels of the past half-century have become the commonplaces or even the rejected crudities of the next; when the forces of steam are obsolete and electricity is the slowest power we deal with; when our population instead of merely eighty millions approaches two hundred millions, as it surely must, long before the end of the century, as the scientific advances, which even such an age will count miraculous, burst upon us, what is the poor human American to do, in his present fever and with his present nerves, but with fivefold greater powers placed in his hands, and fivefold greater attention and capacity demanded for their control? If sixty years ago the free forces and rushing advance of the Republic urgently needed the regulation of a powerful and learned conservative body, who can overestimate the necessity for such service now?

When you ask how it is to be rendered, one cannot be mistaken in turning first to those priceless qualities in any sound national life, whose tendency to decay we noted at the outset. Give back to us our Faith. Give back to us a serious and worthy Purpose. Restore sane views of life, of our own relations to it, and of our relations to those who share it with us. Moderation in our conceit of our own almightiness will surely follow, moderation in the intolerant assertion of our own rights, moderation in meddling with the rights of others, some tendency to thought before action, some continuity of

conduct personal and public, and some reference of policy to enduring principle.

Outside the immediate and inestimable effect on the family, the conservative power of educated women will naturally show its first and perhaps its chief influence in the next greatest among the forces that guide the world—that of social life. They will surely help to check its degradation. They may make it regain its soothing relaxation, and its benign stimulus for the best in every one. They may even give back to society the inspiration it once had for the leaders of the world's work. They will certainly correct the prevalent vicious conception of its real scope. They will reject the notion that it is a sort of trade to which a few devote themselves as most others do to the other pursuits of life; that thus there are, in the vulgar phrase of the day, society women, just as there are shop women, or cleaning women, and that each class must stick to its trade: that, in fact, what is called our best society is a strictly limited sort of trades union, unfriendly to the admission of apprentices not coming from its own ranks, and that it is an imperative necessity for outsiders with social aspirations to force their way into it by push and notoriety, trick and device, if they would avoid social extinction! From this degrading conception comes the constant craze for newspaper publicity, and every other form of publicity; from this paltry scheming, the vulgar push, the endless flattery and insincerity and loss of self-respect by foolish aspirants, who seem all the time to ignore or be unconscious of the blighting influence, in the glare and heat and dust of such an arena, upon all the finer qualities that make women adorable and human life attractive.

If the conduct of the so-called inner circles of society has sometimes seemed to justify this brazen uproar at their gates, so much greater the demand for the conservative influence and the real refinement that come from the higher training of superior women. When other ideals are cherished, when faith and purpose in life reassert their sway, society will look for its leaders even less than it really does to-day, to the embellished matrons still friskily playing tomboy, and noisily marshalling, for fresh

extravagances of social demeanor and amusement, their collections of dashing young centaurs from the race-track and the hunting-field, and of handsome young cigarette-smoking experts from the bridge-table.

When these higher ideals do return, the powerful influence of educated women will surely array, as never before, the best of their sex in compact, resistless phalanx against a social evil, alarming, degrading, and demoralizing, which has suddenly become almost too common to provoke surprise—the transformation of marriage from a sacrament of God into a thoughtless and headlong business or social arrangement, to be dissolved almost at pleasure. Six hundred and fifty-four thousand persons divorced in this country in twenty years, and those not the last—such is the deplorable record on which Catholic and Protestant clergy are already appealing for a union of all moral agencies to retard this downward rush of the multitude.

The same influence should help resist the yet more common weakening of family ties and destruction of family life. It should correct at the origin of the evil the extraordinary development of nervous excitability that accounts for so much of our fickleness of view and instability of belief; for the frequent outbursts of general turbulence and lawlessness through whole zones of population; for the varied and incredible character of the crimes, for the amazing publicity which attends them, and the ready imitation which the wide knowledge of every new crime often stimulates.

Perhaps the same influence may even penetrate the citadels better intrenched, those of evils that come from the ill-judged excesses of the best of people. It may possibly infuse moderation into our new and admirable devotion to athletics, and rescue us from those vagaries of sport run mad that have made the football teacher more important in our universities than the professor of chemistry or of philosophy, and the record of the cinder-track the essential thing rather than the baccalaureate degree.

Harder task yet, it may restore sanity to our charity run mad; may teach us the infinite harm that lurks in our lazy way of ridding ourselves from each casual beggar with a careless

quarter instead of a careful inquiry; and may even, after a time, stop the premium we put upon crime and crankiness when we build palaces for our lunatics and our criminals, and sustain them in these establishments in a comfort, and even luxury, far beyond the average of what the taxpayers who meet the bills can afford for themselves. Under your guidance the moderate conclusion may in fact be reached that, even for sweet Charity's sake, the upright, industrious New York farmer or mechanic or shopkeeper is not bound to house and feed the crank and the criminal better than he can the children of his loins and the wife of his bosom.

Are the burdens thus laid out for the conservative and moderating influence of the educated women of the land too weighty to be borne? I do not believe it. I am full of good hope for the future—more hopeful to-night than before I saw the late work of Vassar, more hopeful at every addition to the splendid array of its followers, Smith, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, Barnard, Radcliffe, and the rest, with which our country now leads the world in the advanced education of women.

But that you may not fall short of the full measure of your high capacities and still higher calling, let me ask your attention to a fact, and put to you a question about it. It is a fact, almost a commonplace—at any rate, it is a fact which I venture to affirm, and believe to be beyond intelligent contradiction—that the young ladies here at eighteen average higher than any corresponding body of boys at the same age in any corresponding institution. My question is, How will it be at twenty-eight? On your answer to that question depends our hope that the educated women of the country may furnish the conservative force of our land which the English philosopher led us to expect, and the Frenchman to see that we needed.

Is it not the frequent experience that from the moment of entering society the girl almost stands still,—is at least surely and generally passed by the boy,—and that in maturity and middle life the relative positions are apt to be reversed? The question is not raised with any thought of suggesting competition. Among all the disagreeable things brought forward by the new

school, the most hateful is this thought of rivalry between the sexes, or of any necessary or natural antagonism of interests. My closing suggestion, then, with reference to the opportunities before you, and the country's need of you is, not the duty of rivalry, but the duty of growth. For, never forget, it was merely of the body, not of the intellectual or the spiritual man, the declaration was made that you cannot by taking thought add one cubit to your stature. When a tree ceases to grow, your science teaches you that it should be harvested. When the sun ceases to rise, its shadows fall mournfully eastward and the day is surely drawing to its close. When you cease to grow you have already begun to decay. Grow then, while you live; grow to the full height of the duties we have seen. The land never needed you as it does to-day; you will never see a day in which it will not need you more and more.

XXV

MANHOOD

"THE SELECTION OF ONE'S LIFE WORK'

BY

E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

WE have dwelt long upon questions of youth, the early days, the period of preparation for the larger business of life. We have seen the grave mistakes which, in the opinion of our leaders, are apt to be made at every step. Turn now to the question of highest import. Childhood, the playtime, having been danced through somehow, to one tune or another, and being at last set aside, how shall we decide upon, how enter upon the career of manhood? What path should each one of us follow? And how shall each one know to select that path?

In this truly momentous issue we seek the advice of President Andrews of the University of Nebraska. The following address from his pen is here reprinted with his consent and by the courteous permission of Mr. E. Brisbane Walker, in whose Cosmopolitan Magazine *it was originally printed. President Andrews has himself been so successful in his career that he may well counsel others. He has been successively principal of the Connecticut Literary Institute, President of Denison University in Ohio, President of Brown University, and Superintendent of the Chicago public schools before occupying his present distinguished position.*

THE selection of the field in which one's life-work is to be done is a momentous act. A wise choice in the matter is in itself a fortune; an error in it can hardly ever be recalled, and nearly always involves losses and pain for which no good fortune afterward can make amends. In every community one

meets victims of ill guidance in this all-important matter; men who, at the critical point in the journey of life, took the wrong road. Some of them succumb quickly and die. Others wander aimlessly and hopelessly about, hardly attempting to advance. Many another bravely struggles on, only to find, when all his strength is wasted, that the path is too rough, crooked, or long for him, or that it traverses country which he is constitutionally unable to love. Is it not inexpressibly sad that thousands of human lives should be rendered useless and unhappy in these ways? Cannot something be done to abate the evil?

At first glance it is surprising that comparatively little has been written on a subject so important. The explanation probably is that the choice of a life-rôle constitutes in each instance a highly personal affair, in which it seems folly for any but the man himself to take part. And, certainly, the choice must finally be made by each for himself. Outside advice or hints, the best saws of sages or philosophers, can never, in this weighty business, take the place of our own insight, discretion, and will.

Yet few solve the problem of a life-calling wholly without counsel. Consciously or otherwise we are, in our decision, helped by what we know of others' decisions. Reflections on the subject by students of human nature seeking the causes of success and of failure in life greatly aid many. It is believed that helpful direction of this kind may be extended further than it has yet been. There may also usefully be given some account of the special advantages and disadvantages of each several profession or calling, the rewards and amenities to be hoped for in it, and the temptations, hardships, and other infelicities which it devotees must brave. The present paper merely introduces the discussion of these topics, on which other writers, specialists, will enlarge.

Certain favored spirits are never under the necessity of choosing their path in life. Most geniuses are such. They are foreordained to this or that mission and somehow become aware of it in good time. From his earliest boyhood Robert E. Lee, like young Hannibal of old, felt called to the profession

of arms. Before he was ten Thorwaldsen carved beautifully in wood, excelling his father, whose trade it was, and evoking from many observant ones the prophecy that the lad would make a great sculptor. Probably no artist ever becomes famous who is not moved in the direction of his destiny quite early. And many a man neither a genius nor an artist is so obviously fitted for some particular occupation that he need never worry or even deliberate over the question in what field he shall earn his bread. All these cases, however, are exceptional: the majority of human beings are not so fortunate.

A man may be far from sure what business he ought to adopt, yet really have a pronounced aptitude in some special direction. In such a case the proper precept is: Follow your bent. If the subject possesses various species of ability but is peculiarly brilliant in some one, this, his main forte, is the thing to give him his cue. Highly versatile people, mentally alert, interested in all the departments of science and of fact, and having considerable but nearly equal powers in various ways, are in much danger of vacillation between two or more forms of endeavor, dawdling a while over each, till all their richness of faculty is spent and success impossible. The man preaches, we will say, until some reverse overtakes him at that work. Cast down, and aware that he can teach, instead of redoubling his efforts to succeed in the activity first chosen, he throws it up and crosses over, a beginner, to the school-room. Sooner or later he becomes discouraged here as well. Having once yielded to depression he probably falls prey to it again, now exchanging the school for the law-office. How many potentially invaluable lives are wasted in such fatal meandering!

Your dull fellow, lacking all special mental interest and without any sense of function or of power, may quite possibly turn out much better than that. If, somehow, he once gets launched in a given enterprise, being single-minded and free from distraction, he is likely to develop triumphant concentration of attention and energy. But how is he to make the start? Perhaps arbitrarily, by a sort of flop, lunging for the first opportunity to work. Splendid results often wait upon such a choice. Better, however go bv friends' advice. President Francis

Wayland used strongly to insist that a man's friends are often, if not always, better judges of his qualifications for a given career than the man himself. Only, when he puts his hand to the craft picked out for him—this, too, formed part of Wayland's philosophy—he must determine to succeed and hence work like a demon. Interest in the undertaking, even devotion, will then come.

Still more important is the judgment of acquaintances when a candidate inclines to a profession through some whim and not from any kind of rational consideration. A pious lad may fancy that he is called to holy orders, when the church or the bishop knows better. It often sorely taxes wit to break up a reasonless preconception like this, the victim, dominated by his one idea, being incorrigible; but friendship cannot possibly be better employed. Once in many cases the notion of duty for which no reason can be assigned seems to prove justified, the subject, when he has become successful, turning back to laugh at those who would have brought him to a different mind. It is true, notwithstanding, that a man can rarely with safety give himself to a course of life unless his fitness therefor rests upon specific qualities and powers of his so obvious that his intimates easily recognize them.

Not seldom a victim of delusion in respect to his calling has been beguiled by doting parents. They devoutly wished their son to be, say, a minister; and therefore took it for granted, teaching him to do the same, that this was his appointed destiny. Parents can commit no greater indiscretion than that, nor can a child be subjected to a deeper unkindness. Among the bitterest disillusionments which the writer has ever witnessed were those of young men who, trained all through the ardor of boyhood to suppose as a matter of both filial and religious duty that they were to become ministers, yet, possessing no taste or aptitude for that, at last, broken-hearted, saw their error, heroically renounced ministerial study and struck into other paths. So painful a rupture of family and personal expectations requires immense courage, carrying with it correspondingly great danger of mean compromise. Youth should never needlessly be forced into so fiery a trial.

If there are some who deem themselves suited to a calling when they are not, a much larger number foolishly dread suggested callings out of a belief that they could not succeed in them. I am no speaker, a man says; I cannot make either the law or the ministry my orbit. But you have vocal organs, and they can be cultivated. You may also possess all the necessary logical powers. Perhaps all you lack is training, information, and hard work. The majority of men have greater versatility than they imagine. Within pretty large limits any fairly bright candidate can succeed reasonably well in any occupation to which he gives himself with sufficient preparation and energy. It cannot be too often or vehemently urged that in these days of desperate competition any man, a genius even, however perfectly adapted to his branch of activity, will fail unless he starts with a good outfit and then works hard early and late. On the other hand, in our era of specialization, every profession has a number of facets. It may be true that you would fail as a pleader, but you might succeed splendidly as counsel, and perhaps rise to be a judge. You might successfully argue civil cases yet find it well to avoid criminal cases. One clergyman does best as a preacher; another, not a star in the pulpit, accomplishes vast good as a pastor. Nearly every profession is thus cut up, making place for diverse tastes and talents.

Besides objections to the different spheres of professional enterprise based on fear of personal unfitness, numerous scruples connect themselves with the nature or circumstances of the callings themselves. To these we now attend. The observations offered are in each case simply suggestive, not exhaustive, indicating the scope and method of the inquiry, and leaving to other writers the larger and more special arguments constituting the case *in extenso* for and against each several profession.

In proceeding with this provisional and illustrative study, let us consider, first, the office of the religious teacher. Despite all the modifications which this office has undergone, it is still a most influential one, and is certain to continue so.

No doubt theology has greatly changed and is rapidly

changing. Sacred books, once treated wholly as oracles, are more and more regarded as literature. Inspiration is ascribed to their spirit, not to their text. Actual faith is less and less based on philological or historical arguments. The great rubrics of the creeds are in process of rewriting, old language being altered considerably and old emphasis much more. Church and synagogue are not venerated as in former years. Not only do sceptics and infidels ignore them, but the same is done by an increasing company among believers, on the ground that both institutions have renounced their pristine ideals, forgetting the poor and lowly. Nor does it yet appear where the revolution thus hinted at is to end.

For all this, it would be folly to expect, as some seem to do, that the function of organized religion will be set aside. Religion is an integral element of human nature; you cannot annul it. Moreover, its normal working is social, producing a community, which must have organizers, teachers, and leaders. Let the form, profession, creed, and specific aims of ecclesiastical society change as they will, the society itself must remain, with most of its historic power; officers for it will be in demand; and their influence will continue immense. Newspapers and books can never supplant oral speech; nor will the desultory orator upon sacred topics ever take the place of the stated preacher, who knows the people personally and sympathizes with their needs. Private pastoral counsel, too, no less than public religious instruction and admonition, can be counted upon as among society's permanent resources for improvement.

A young man meditating entrance upon the sacred office may, therefore, be sure that if he does well in it he will never lack occupation or influence. The vocation, besides, possesses many elements of attractiveness. Incessant converse with the highest truths is a rare privilege, which religious teachers almost alone can enjoy. This, as well as the entire nature of their work, tends to evoke in sincere men of the cloth a certain beautiful refinement and spirituality of mind which few others can attain. Their manner of life moves them to self-denial, charity, and kindness, helping them to rate worldly fortune as not the highest good. Clergymen even the busiest, get

opportunity for reading beyond most others, and in consequence the clergy probably average to be better informed than any other profession. Also, no other furnishes so large a proportion of good speakers.

Clerical work, of course, has certain infelicities, although several of these which are often and pre-eminently mentioned are much less forbidding than is commonly supposed.

As reported, Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale recently remarked: "Young men come to me asking what vocation they shall choose, and when I suggest the ministry they throw up their hands in dismay and respond that they cannot lead a life in which they are compelled to follow to the letter the dictates of another."

Such youth evidently judge that to secure ordination, or retention in the ministry after ordination, they must slavishly follow some creed. Formerly, and indeed not very long ago, there was reason for this solicitude even in the more enlightened communions; but the danger is rapidly lessening, being now rare, local, and ready to disappear. Religious people appraising a leader think much less of his creed than formerly, much more of his spirit and character. If they find him sensible, serious, thoughtful, eager to do men good, they are usually not unwilling to let him separate and preach as he pleases, even if he should vent a good deal of what they deem heresy.

Much is made of the fact that congregations sometimes dismiss their ministers on mere caprice, and that clergymen over fifty are less in demand than younger and less able competitors. That cases of such injustice and folly occur no observer can doubt; but we believe them relatively rare. Often the fault is emphatically not in the congregation but in the incumbent or candidate, who has remitted zeal and becomes selfish and unprogressive; no fit example, leader, or instructor. Suffering parishes do not publish their griefs so readily as displaced clergymen do.

We here face one of the real infelicities of the holy calling, the temptation which it offers to be indolent. In no other sphere of life is one so destitute as here of effective spur to hard

and incessant toil. So far as the employment of his time is concerned, the clergyman is his own master. If he will, he can rise late and idle away the best hours nearly every day. He can gad about, attend parties, lounge at his club or sleep, with little fear that any parishioner will take him to task in time to do him any good. Many fall victims to this seduction, postponing work to pastime and contracting habits of idleness, at length losing all power of application and being deservedly cast aside for better men.

Another extremely real temptation besetting clergymen is that to insincerity, arising from the routine character of their ministrations. The very business which engages them being of a sacred nature, they come to consider their performance of it as of necessity proper in temper. But it need not be so. Good habits are highly dangerous to morality, more so than aught else save bad habits. Liturgical acts executed in a careless spirit cannot but result in hollow character.

More than any other servant of the public a pastor of a church is in peril from what we may term "coddling." If he is popular, and often when he is not so, many praise every utterance of his as "eloquent," "scholarly," "most edifying," or as noteworthy in some other aspect. Elderly ladies are a clergyman's worst enemies in this. Their habit of greeting him after each service with those stupidly laudatory estimates of his effort is not all. Foolishly tender inquiries about his health follow. He seems to them to look pale and to need rest. Will he not please be good to himself, remit his arduous spiritual labors for a few days, and go recuperate at yonder retreat? Some fear that this will not suffice; the reverend gentleman must take a tour in Europe. They raise the money for this purpose, and bundle the sturdy victim off upon the next Liverpool steamer. How often is not a clergyman's self-respect undermined in ways like these! Worse influence upon his character could hardly be imagined, unless it were being sent abroad at the expense of some one rich parishioner. Every offer of such a personal donation let the minister resolutely decline, unless he wishes terribly to impair his moral sensibility and his power to bless men. If it never thus mortgaged itself to Dives in the pew, the pulpit

would have little reason to dread the danger of speaking out against social wrongs.

We hope it is made clear in the above that the clerical calling, if entered upon and pursued in the right spirit, is a useful and honorable one, and that more of those who possess the necessary qualifications for it ought to be encouraged to adopt it.

The lawyer, like the clergyman, is to continue with us, a necessary factor in social administration. The notion which seems to prevail that lawyers' work is unnecessary is untenable. Activity in the legal line is, in some form or other, indispensable. Civilization renders society complex. The complexity early becomes so dense that those not bred to the mystery, of course the great majority, are unable to understand the relations which society has come to hold toward its members or those which the members hold one toward another. Much legislation and legal procedure, many practices of judges and of lawyers, are certainly most wry and not at all necessary, and we may look for improvement in this respect; but law practice itself will not pass away. Moreover, the net result of lawyers' work is advantageous. With all their faults, lawyers probably settle out of court more cases than they litigate.

Prejudice against lawyers is very general and strong. Many believe that lawyers always act insincerely. Many consider every lawyer a liar, taking it to be the lawyer's express aim in pleading cases to try and make the worse appear the better reason. This misapprehension perhaps arises from the fact that even the most reputable attorneys are known at times to defend persons and cases secretly believed by them to be unworthy. Superficially this habit seems indefensible, and people naturally conclude that if the best attorneys are guilty of it the entire profession deserves ill repute.

But is it true that a bad case at law should not be defended, and that the lawyer championing such should in all instances be blamed? It is not true.

Perhaps one in a thousand real criminals would secure fair treatment if undefended; but the vast majority, were there no friendly scrutiny of the evidence against them, were they

left to be dealt with, free from all check, by the average jury or judge, liable to prejudice, passion, or both, would inevitably receive sentences undeservedly severe. And taking a great many cases together, it is probably best that the guilty man's counsel should not only plead all palliating circumstances, but should go further and place the client in the most favorable light which can be thrown upon him. If in this way justice is sometimes foiled, it almost certainly gains on the whole.

There is, however, a practice somewhat analogous to that of defending criminals which we believe to be illegitimate, deserving of reprobation, and to this practice is largely due the popular harsh estimate of the legal profession. A wealthy corporation, let us suppose, wishes to carry through some scheme which is disadvantageous to the community. It retains as counsel for this purpose some legal gentleman who is eminent as a citizen. The gentleman permits himself to "appear" on behalf of the corporation, well knowing that what it is hoped to secure through him is, not the exhibition of his client's case in the best producible color (which would be proper and right), but the influence, on that side, of his personality as a citizen. Often the counsel "appears" and that is all; he does not utter a word. Although analogous to legitimate advocacy, no doubt an outgrowth from that and owing to that its life, this habit is not legitimate advocacy. It is a form of bartering one's name for money, a huckstering transaction in which the attorney treats his reputation as a commodity.

Clearly lawyers, like clergymen, have their special temptations. If the priest may become hollow-hearted in his way, the man of law may crawl to the same level by a path all his own. He comes in contact with men's meaner side. He is often rasped by clients, snubbed by the court, insulted by opposing counsel. At times he is as good as obliged to play a part, to seem to wish what he does not and not to wish what he actually does wish. Hypocrites may certainly result from this masquerade; yet they are no necessary product of it. Upon reflection it does not appear that a devotee of the law need find it on the whole at all harder to maintain a solid and upright character than a man in any other walk.

If now and then one calls doctors quacks, betraying a prejudice against medical men similar to that felt against lawyers, the sentiment in this case is certainly less general and powerful than in the other. Medicine nearly all deem a noble calling. The trained physician is a benefactor to the community; in the alleviation of men's immediate and most conscious ills, his work is beneficent beyond any other human mission. No other class of public servants, not even clergymen, exhibit greater unselfishness or perform a larger amount of unpaid service.

Disinclination to enter the medical profession is usually based on other objections. Many dislike a physician's life as involving constant contact with what is morbid, with disease, wounds, and death.

Certain young men of a fine mental type are repelled from the profession because of its alleged unscientific character. Such ought to specialize in surgery; for this, now that anæsthesia and asepsis are both in the field, is a science indeed, whose progress in recent years is nothing less than astounding, as delectable to the scientific sense as it is benign in view of the maladies which it heals.

It is hardly just any longer to speak of medicine itself as not scientific, if by medicine is meant the sum total of present knowledge on the subject. Confessedly the science of medicine to-day is far in advance of the practice. Right here, in fact, one would think, earnest youth might find a powerful motive for becoming physicians. By thorough preparation in the first place, followed by tact and persistence in practice, patients and their friends may be brought to submit to rational procedure in disease, letting it supplant those time-honored but pernicious methods to which such hordes now yearly succumb. Another consideration favoring choice of the medical profession ought to be found in the magnificent opportunity offered every practitioner to-day to substitute the prevention of disease, through inculcation of hygiene and sanitation, for the work of trying to remedy disease when it supervenes.

No one would object to entrance upon the teacher's mission on the ground of its being not useful or worthy. It is one of

the distinctly and unequivocally honorable callings. Every grade of it from the highest down to the lowest offers opportunity for invaluable helpfulness to the public and to the race.

This vocation also, however, has its drawbacks. Teachers' remuneration is as a rule low in comparison with their exertions. The highest salaries which instructors of youth receive are far beneath those common among lawyers, physicians, and business men. If you become a pedagogue you resign expectation of acquiring wealth, unless from some source outside your occupation. Another and a much unhappier circumstance attending this line of life is its liability to make its devotee a recluse, out of touch with the active, earnest affairs of men. Unless on his guard, he becomes dried-up, crusty, misanthropic. This danger at first seems unaccountable, owing to the teacher's privilege of constantly standing face to face with children and youth, who are wide awake, ardent, and buoyant. But while he indeed confronts these, he can hardly mingle with them very much. The fact that the teacher is forever talking down, addressing those who know less than he, and never his equals, inclines him to pedantry also, the characteristic vice of the profession.

Journalism is the profession which one least likes to recommend a young man to undertake. Being approached for advice, you always hope that the applicant, if he tries newspaper work, will rise above the position of a mere drudge reporter, while you can rarely if ever be sure that he will climb high enough to be independent. The business of gathering news is respectable and very useful, and there is no reason why one engaged in it should not perfectly maintain his honor. The same is true of editorial or high-class journalistic writing, in which one is permitted to speak his mind. But between these two sorts of journalistic functionaries there is a third most unenviable type. We refer to the writers who, to retain their situations, must every now and then defend doings and policies which they abhor. In every occupation a subordination often painfully near to humiliation will at times be found necessary till you show yourself a master in the business and mount toward

the top. But such servitude is believed to be nowhere else so complete as in the phase of journalism just referred to.

Drawing upon paragraphs in the writer's little book "Wealth and Moral Law," we next enter a plea in favor of "business" in the usual sense—the winning, or the effort to win, wealth. The existence of wealth is morally legitimate. Whatever is needful to the life and weal of man has a right to be. Wealth is certainly such. It is simply humanity's stock in trade, men's tools and machinery wherewith to get their living. Without a vast supply of such instrumentalities the very existence of our race in its present extent would be impossible. Comfort, culture, civilization, would be still further out of the question. So long as all must use each moment of time and ounce of strength in fighting hunger, savagery is the inevitable lot.

Wealth is necessary not as an evil but as a good. Confessedly, it is often hoarded with an evil intent, and often put to wrong uses; but we should be foolish to stigmatize it as an evil on this account. No one calls machinery an evil because of its friction, although, as far as man's present knowledge extends, the friction is inevitable. The ills attending wealth are much more likely than those of machinery to be some day eliminated.

The wealth, however large, of one man does not necessarily involve the poverty of any other man. It is a great error to suppose that the wealth of the world, or of any community, is a fixed, limited sum, like the shares in a bank, so that, if you should get a dollar more than you now have, I must put up with a dollar less than I now have. There are cases indeed where one's gain involves another's loss; where, that is, a man's gain is got through open or occult legal or illegal robbery. But wealth can increase, increase to any sum, without this or any injustice.

Hence—whatever may at some future time be the case—as things are, it is no sin to get rich. This is not the same as saying that wealth is legitimate, because vast wealth might be present without a single rich man—precisely what socialists wish and expect. Should their régime ever be launched and work as they predict, private riches would be wrong. But, under the

prevalence of our present individualistic system, which, mark, no one and no group of us can change at will, the private massing and holding of wealth not only does not necessarily involve aught of injury to anyone, but may, and perhaps in most cases does, benefit all concerned.

It is often said that one cannot with any assurance of success engage in business as now pursued without resorting to immoral and dishonorable practices. Painfully much as such a statement has to go upon, it is too sweeping. Fraud and underhandedness are doubtless common in most businesses; yet we can see, looking in any direction, respectable competencies built up no dollar of which is any wise tainted. Without too great strain upon charity, we may suppose that many vicious business methods are resorted to out of ignorance, and will be disused when they are understood. And there is reason to hope that business men's consciences as well as their minds are receiving light. This is largely due to the fact that so many men of determined integrity have pursued business careers without ever descending from the plane of honor.

If there is a profession which more safely than any other can be recommended as peculiarly enticing in itself, vastly and directly useful to mankind and not as yet overcrowded, it is engineering in its various phases and branches—civil, chemical, mechanical, electrical, mining, sanitary, hydraulic. Engineers' work, the subjection of man's material environment to man's service, is only well begun. It must and will go on, and it will go far very soon. Probably no man living has more than the faintest foregleam of the development which even the next fifty years have in store for this feature of our civilization. The force working here will have to be vastly enlarged. Only, be it observed, numbers are here, as elsewhere, of much less consequence than quality. If thorough preparation for one's profession is always important, as is certainly true, it is specially vital to success in engineering, where so much depends on exact knowledge, where mathematics and acquaintance with physical laws figure so conspicuously. Besides being in a high degree both useful and intellectual, engineering is a form of activity in which, if you are thoroughly qualified for it and unremittingly

industrious, excellent remuneration may be expected, and that without resort to doubtful devices.

At the risk of offending some readers and surprising more, we venture, lastly, to speak of politics as in itself a highly desirable profession. Good citizens who are so situated that they can compete for public office ought to be encouraged to do so. No more useful career is possible in this age than is presented by politics conscientiously prepared for and pursued. The common thought that it is mean to seek office or to accept an office unless it has sought the man, is wholly perverse. We need that hosts of thoroughly able and moral young men, well trained in political and social science, including ethics, should set politics before themselves as their life-work. Do not sneer at professional politics if only it is of the right kind. Politics ought to be a profession. Rightly followed, it would be a noble one.

To be a public servant after this fashion would require extraordinary grace. To succeed, one must religiously cultivate the hard side of his nature, never to face wicked men, kindly to endure lies, libels, and the whole contradiction of the public's enemies against him, to give blows as well as take them. Where are the men who will covet political careers with this spirit, preparing for, and if possible entering, public life with a determination to make it purer and more efficient, not waiting to be asked and urged to do this, but seeking places of trust, competing with selfish schemers for chances to exert great power in the capital affairs of men?

XXVI

THE COLLEGE GRADUATE

"COLLEGE TRAINING AND THE BUSINESS MAN"[1]

BY

CHARLES F. THWING

PRESIDENT OF WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

FOR a moment here we face the intensely practical. There is a cry throughout the business world that the college education must justify itself or must disappear from among men of business, that its acquisition is an ornament to the idle rich, a necessity perhaps to the lawyer and the doctor, but that it must be dispensed with by those who seek practical success in a wider field. Such a movement would be a reversal of the wheels of progress. Yet to dismiss the outcry as mere ignorance and narrowness is a folly possible only to the narrow and the ignorant. A thoughtful attempt is here made by Dr. Thwing to view the question from all sides, to see why and when the college man fails and why and when he succeeds beyond his less favored brethren.

As our author hints, the problem is really one dependent on the individual. No amount of education whatsoever can make brains. It can only develop them. To measure a peculiarly able and energetic young fellow who lacks a collegiate education against a weakling who has been given opportunities beyond his calibre, who possesses a sword he cannot wield, this is idle talk. Dr. Thwing measures the best against the best, points out frankly where the college seems to fail, and, though a college president himself, shows no partiality for his own side of the question. He quotes successful men from every point of view. His conclusion does not urge any promiscuous

[1] Reprinted by special permission from *The North American Review*, Copyright, 1903, by The North American Review Publishing Co.

rush of all young men to educational institutions, but only points out the value of higher training for certain youth under certain clearly marked conditions.

THE world is becoming a vast industrial condition. The basis of society is changed from the military and the domestic to the economic and industrial. The conquest of the world by aggressive peoples is now made rather through the locomotive and the steel bridge than through the rifle. In this condition the United States is a leading power. But these industrial forces which spread themselves round the world are the strongest at home. The United States is both a vast machine-shop and a vast farm; and what lies between the shop and the farm is covered by equally vast systems of railroads. These conditions are formed into great combinations of individuals and of capital. From the individual to the partnership, from the partnership to the corporation, from the corporation to the combination of corporations commonly known as the trust, is the order of development.

This industrial process and also the unifying process in industry will undoubtedly continue. A great financier of New York has recently said that the uniting of banks and financial institutions would continue, if men could be found to manage the resulting combinations.

To this condition, therefore, in which the United States finds itself, as a manager of enormous business interests, what is the relation of the American college? What can the American college do to make these interests more worthy of humanity and more helpful to the noblest and richest life? What, too, can the American college do to make these business interests themselves more efficient and more remunerative?

The principal means which the American college can use in helping the industrial condition lies in the furnishing of well-equipped workers. But some affirm that the college does not equip, much less well equip, its graduates to be workers in the world's hard work. A leader in American industrial life says:

"I do not think that the college graduate has any advantages in entering business over the graduate of a high or grammar

school. My preference has always been for boys to come to me direct from school and at the age of eighteen, because my experience has shown me that the four years spent in college are not worth as much to him, if he is to become a business man or manufacturer, as the same time in actual business experience. The average college graduate is apt to feel that he is so educated that he is disinclined to begin at the bottom; or, if the case is exceptional and the young man is willing to begin on the lowest round of the ladder, he often becomes discouraged by seeing younger fellows in positions several years in advance of him. There is a great deal to be gained by the discipline of daily life that comes with drudgery, such as the washing of ink-stands, cleaning windows, carrying bundles, and sweeping out the store, although, unfortunately for the boy's own good, the conditions are such at the present day that he is not called upon to do that work as was the custom a generation ago. I used to say that I did not care to hire a boy who owned a dress suit. Of course, there are exceptions; but, if one wants to succeed as a business man, he must begin by making sacrifices, and anything which shows a tendency toward extravagance is not a promising indication. I would advise a boy of eighteen who wants to become a merchant, a business man, or a distributor of products, to go into the business at that age and not go to college. I would not, however, underrate a college education. For a lawyer, a doctor, an engineer, or a successful member of any of the other learned professions, I believe the university education is almost a necessity. The primary object of all education should be to teach boys and girls how to provide for themselves food, clothing, and shelter."

The proposition which I desire to support is, that the graduate of the American college, other things or qualities being the same, is best fitted to administer the great industrial movement. He is the one who, on the whole, can most wisely lead and most effectively carry forward the business interests of the United States.

In order to get a fair field for our discussion, it may be just as well at once to clear away certain difficulties. Let me say at once that certain boys should not go to college. Boys who

dislike study should not go, for they are in peril of becoming social rebels and pessimists. Boys who cannot bear freedom should not go, for they are in peril of becoming slaves to unworthy habits. Boys who are lazy should not go, for they are in peril of adopting a soft, luxurious life, which it is difficult to throw off and which ill becomes the hard worker in the workaday world of the new America. Of course, the number of boys of these three classes is not small. The going to a college is not a question touching the mass, it is a question touching the individual. Whether the son of a family should or should not go to college is a question as personal as was the question whether the parents of that son should in the first place become husband and wife.

It is also evident that certain business callings demand a technical training. This training may be given, in part at least, through a college of liberal learning, or it may be given through a technical or scientific school. The work of the engineer, civil, mechanical, electrical, demands such a training. This training is as necessary to the engineer as is the training in law to the lawyer, or in medicine to the physician. Whether the engineer, before taking his technical studies, should first have the advantage of a general college course is a question which does not immediately relate to the present discussion, although be it said in passing that opinion is coming to favor the view that the technical school is purely a professional school.

The present discussion, moreover, does not concern the general advantages of a college course. These advantages, in the form of making desirable friendships, promoting a high type of the gentleman, inspiring one to nobler service for society and the state, no one seeks to depreciate. They are great. Even were there no other results, they would make the college course worth while to most men. A graduate who entered the cattle business, in which, too, he was not successful, says of his college course:

"I think I am safe in saying that if I had the decision to make over again I should again take the college education. It may not make great returns on the investment, in actual money, but to the man who has the taste and determination

it makes, I feel, adequate returns in the enlarged field he is given for the pursuits of his life with happiness to himself and with some benefit to those about him."

Now to the main proposition: The college man in business is worth more than the same man would be without a college education. The elements that go to make up the value of the business man to his business are many; and the elements which go to make up the value of the college to the student are also many.

First of them all is the intellectual element. The leader in a great business primarily needs, of all the intellectual parts, the power to think. "What do the men whom you employ," I asked the manager of one of the great industrial combinations, "need the most?" "Brains" was the prompt answer. "What do those men lack?" I said to a great manufacturer of steel and iron products. "Accuracy, the power to take a large view and to investigate thoroughly," was the reply. The merchant and the manufacturer are called on to analyze and synthesize phenomena, to relate fact to fact and truth to truth, to assess every fact or truth at its proper value, to determine the significance of the symbol, to reason logically, to relate principle to rule and rule to principle, to trace effect to cause, to distinguish the essential from the accidental, and to hold the necessary and essential under a large variety of conditions and circumstances.

These are the very intellectual qualities which the college is supposed to discipline. The knowledge which one gains in college is of no, or small, consequence. In fact, knowledge as an end is vastly overestimated in all educational judgments, and knowledge as a means to power is as vastly underestimated. Two friends of mine have recently said to me, in answer to my question regarding the good of a college course to them, that it consists in the cultivation of the primary intellectual quality of thinking. One says: "College training teaches one to go to work at any task with system and method, in the consciousness that one has acquired the ability to *think* through, quickly and logically, the questions which come up"; and another says: "College training has enabled me to appreciate

more fully and to practise more diligently precision and system. Unless I am very much mistaken the close of my academic life finds me much stronger from the point of view both of synthesis and of analysis."

The men now at the head of great industrial corporations believe that this intellectual quality is of great value. Mr. W. F. Merrill, First Vice-President of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, says:

"It has been my experience that men with a college education make better help than men of about the same calibre who have not had that advantage, when they get to a point where their experience warrants putting them into advanced positions; and that it does not take them so long a time to get to a point where they can be safely promoted. A college education gives a young man habits of study and application which are invaluable. He learns how to use his brains to better advantage than one who has not had that training. You might just as well say that an apprenticeship is of no value to a man who is going to follow a particular trade as to say, in the case of a man who is going to use his brains, it is not an advantage to him that he should learn how to use them logically by study. Brains are capable of development the same as muscles, and there is nothing that I know of that will develop brains any faster than systematic study. A well-trained mind thinks more quickly and reaches results more speedily and more accurately," [1]

In the personality of the individual student the chief effect of the college is intellectual, and the chief element in this effect is the increase in what, in a comprehensive and general way, one calls the power of thinking. But this is not the only effect. Intellectual elements do not alone constitute the causes that promote the prosperity of the individual or of the community. Some would say that volitional, emotional, ethical elements constitute causes more important than the intellectual. It is certainly true that a strong will makes as much toward the advancement of one or of all as a clear intellect. For in a strong will are embodied ambition, diligence, persistence—qualities

[1] "The Utility of an Academic Education: an Investigation," R. T. Crane, p. 27.

most valuable. Some would also say that an honest conscience is as important as either clear intellect or strong will.

Now, the training of the will in the college is a thing much more difficult to accomplish than the training of the intellect. For the will is trained by doing, and doing is not the primary function of the college, though it is one of its functions. This inability of the college to train the will in adequate ways is the chief cause of the impression that a college education is of no advantage to the business man, the man whose life consists so largely in doing things. But let no one suppose that the college does nothing in the training of the will. Every effort of the student to master a scholastic problem is an act of the will. Every decision he makes for better or for worse is an act of the will. All co-operative endeavors of college men, and such endeavors are numerous and of great variety, represent the executive function. Not a few men in every college class get larger training for their will than for their intellect.

But now reverts the question of intellectual relations. Let it be granted that the modern business man does need the power of thinking. How does the college increase this power more effectively than business itself?

Thinking is an art. It is, of course, also, a science. But for the college man it is primarily an art. An art is learned by practising it. Thinking is, therefore, learned by thinking. It represents habits of intellectual accuracy, discrimination, comparison, concentration. Such habits are formed by being accurate, discriminating, and by the actual concentration of the mind. A course in education promotes such thinking better than a course in business. For education represents orderliness and system in intellectual effort. The effort proceeds by certain graduated steps, from the easy to the less easy, from the difficult to the more difficult. The purpose is to train in the valuation of principles, which underlie all service, and not in the worth of rules, which are of special and narrow application. The man trained only in business of one kind is not fitted to take up business of a different kind. The broadly trained man is prepared to learn business of any kind, and if business of one kind has been learned he is able to leave it to take up

work of another kind without difficulty. The practice of any art should make the one who practises this art a better thinker in it; but this advantage relates in a large degree to one who has first approached the art through thinking.

I suppose it may be said that the man who is self-educated is usually very narrowly educated. He is educated along and in certain lines. He is educated, so to speak, tangentially. His thinking, too, is usually tangential. It lacks comprehensiveness and a sense of relations. It has force, and the endeavors which spring out of it are forceful; but breadth is sacrificed.

Many and of much variety are the methods adopted to relieve the individual of the necessity of educating himself. Schools of correspondence and evening schools have their place, and for not a few the place is large. So thoroughly worth while are these forms of education that they should be promoted, their weaknesses eliminated, and their points of strength conserved. But the peril against which one is to be on guard in these more or less informal methods is the peril of substituting knowledge for thinking, information for personal inspiration, formal content of learning for large power of achievement.

These perils inhere alike in the more popular and informal methods of education and in that technical and commercial education which the individual gets in business. The education of the college and university seeks to avoid these perils. The university offers opportunities for reasoning and for thinking of all kinds, degrees, orders. It sets forth the exact reasoning of the mathematical sciences—sciences in which things are as they are, as Bishop Butler says, and must be as they must be. It thus confirms the habit of intellectual conviction. It sets forth the general reasoning of language, literature, history, and philosophy, in which truth is to be separated from truth for seeing each more clearly, in which truth is to be united with truth for establishing both more firmly. It uses analysis and synthesis. It uses deductive reasoning and inductive reasoning. It recognizes the uncertainties attending intellectual judgments; a recognition which fixes a habit of intellectual humility. It seeks to assess each fact at its proper value, to use right methods of intellectual procedure, to maintain each faculty of man's whole being in

the performance of its proper function, without interference from other faculties, and to bring forth a well-ordered character as the consummate result.

In this endeavor the content of knowledge plays a less important part than is commonly believed. Content of knowledge for intellectual processes is somewhat akin to content of food for physical processes; the purpose is not to retain the content but to convert the content into health and power. In the intellectual relation, too, as in the physical, one's appetite is a pretty good guide for the selection of content. Certainly no other guide is so good, or so little unworthy, unworthy as at times it may prove to be. To choose certain courses of study in college because one does *not* like them, on the ground that the dislike represents a certain lack of nature which these studies may help to fill, may have a certain degree, though small, of reasonableness. Such choices are medicines. Medicines are necessary, if one be sick. But the mind of the college man should be treated as if it were in a state of health. It, therefore, needs, not medicine, but food. To choose courses of study in college because one does like them represents the hygienic process of assimilation which results in strength, health, growth.

It will usually be found, too, that studies thus chosen are most directly preparatory to one's probable calling in life. For the desire which determines the choice of studies also determines the choice of a vocation. President Eliot writes of his son, Charles:

"He arrived at the end of his Senior year without having any distinct vision of the profession which awaited him, neither he nor his father having perceived his special gifts. Nevertheless, it turned out, after he had settled with joy on his profession, that, if he had known at the beginning of his Sophomore year what his profession was to be, he could not have selected his studies better than he did with only the guidance of his likings and natural interests. He took during his last three years in college all the courses in fine arts which were open to him; he subsequently found his French and German indispensable for wide reading in the best literature of his profession; his studies in science supplied both training and information appro-

priate to his calling; and history and political economy were useful to him as culture studies and for their social bearings." [1]

The college course which Charles Eliot took was on the whole a broad and a broadening one. It was not so broad that it became thin or a means of intellectual dissipation. The broad course is always in peril of becoming a little thin and the narrow course of becoming narrowing. A course can safely to a degree become narrow in case a man knows the channel in which his life is to flow. But most men do not so know. "I am to-day thirty years old, I graduate as a mechanical engineer. I now know I do not want to be a mechanical engineer. I want to be a lawyer." So said a student on the Commencement Day of his scientific school. Ignorance of one's abilities or desires or opportunities should lead one to a broad course of study in the college. Even many of the great manufacturing corporations prefer the liberally to the technically trained graduate. Said a member of a great corporation which builds steel mills round the world:

"The man of liberal education is, on the whole, worth more to us than the man of technical training. He is worth less for a year or two after coming to us, but he has a power for learning all branches of our business which is specially needed."

The peril of overeducation, for those who are to enter business, is a peril in the existence of which I find not a few "captains of industry" believe. By overeducation is meant an education of the intellect which fits the individual to do a higher work than is actually open to him, or a higher work than his other faculties fit him to do. The point at which this danger touches the college relates to the equilibrium of personal forces. The college may draw too heavily on the intellectual resources of the individual. Strength, which in the course of his college career he should have given to the will, the conscience, the heart, the body, may have been given to the intellect. As a result, the graduate may come forth from the college halls bearing a mind disciplined to think, but lacking the power of body or of will to use this disciplined mind. He is like an engine, perfect in every part, but without sufficient steam. Mr. S. R. Callaway,

[1] "Charles Eliot: Landscape Architect," pp. 28, 29.

formerly President of the New York Central Railroad, writes me that a friend of the late Commodore Vanderbilt bore to him from Lord Palmerston a message that it was "a pity a man with so much talent had not the advantages which education gives." "You tell Lord Palmerston from me," said the Commodore, "that if I had learned education I would not have had time to learn anything else." It is a story beneath the humor of which, says Mr. Callaway, "lies more or less of reality." The peril of the overeducation of the intellect is simply the peril of the undereducation of the will, of the conscience, of the heart, of the body. This peril is to be avoided not so much by lessening the education of the intellect as by increasing the education of the body, the heart, conscience and will. The members of the British cabinets of the last twenty-five years illustrate the advantage of a well-proportioned education. All have been, with hardly an exception, graduates of either Oxford or Cambridge; not a few have been honor men. One never forgets Gladstone with his double first-class. But besides whatever intellectual power they possessed, they have been men of great strength of body and of distinct force of will. Unique strength of character has not segregated them from their fellows. They have been at once commanders and servants, men and gentlemen, golf-players and thinkers.

Business of every sort requires men of power: power of intellect, to think; of will, to do; of conscience, to right; of heart, to appreciate, of body, to begin and to endure. Some men possess these manifold powers more largely without a liberal education than other men with a liberal education. But the purpose of the college is not to make men equal, but to develop each to his utmost capacity of development. As a rule, both the ablest men and the men not ablest by nature would become still more able by reason of a liberal education. This is the meaning, I take it, of Prof. Elihu Thompson, who writes saying:

"The boy who does not go to college enters business life earlier, gets an early start, and perhaps loses less of the power of adaptation to his surroundings. The older a man is, the less pliable he becomes; but men differ very widely in this particu-

lar—some crystallize very early, others only in advanced age. Nevertheless, I *do* think that in the great majority of cases whatever disadvantage is at first suffered is more than made up in the end. I can see no reason why higher education should prevent or lessen success in business affairs, which success depends upon good judgment and energy. In manufacturing, and I think to an increasing extent in most business undertakings, a training which leans toward the scientific and technical will, I believe, be of the greatest value. This involves mathematical proficiency in greater or less degree; not mathematics as an abstraction, but in relation to the concrete realities."

And another says:

"If a young man forms no bad habits during his college course, he can well afford to invest four years' time in return for the college friendships, and, more especially, the taste for reading, for study, and the higher and better things of life; and if he accomplishes no more than acquiring such tastes, his time will be well spent in the pleasure and satisfaction that he will receive throughout his life, and in his ability, when he is able to do so, to retire from active business, without feeling that he can enjoy nothing but business. A young man of ability, strong, tactful, determined to succeed, will succeed, with or without a college education; and if he has to work his own way through college so much the better for him, for he starts with a distinct advantage over his fellow-students. Such a young man as I have described will soon overtake those that started in business four years before he did, and his mental training should give him a marked advantage over those that have not received it."

This question of the value of a college training to the man entering business I have discussed simply on the narrow basis of the commercial service. Of course there is another basis, and one which some would call more important. One of my correspondents speaks of a college course as fitting one "to better discern and like all that is noble and beautiful in life"; and another· "College education ought to make him a more reasonable man, and to increase his capacity for enjoyment throughout life." These are values in themselves; and, if one were

inclined to urge the point, one could show that these values have also commercial worth.

One also may be allowed to say that if civilization is to advance it is to advance not through the selfward tendency of the individual and of individual effort, be that tendency either material or intellectual or ethical, but also through altruistic movements. One likes to quote Burke's words: "Society is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection." It is a partnership including generations yet unborn. As one reflects on the condition of the present age, as one reflects on the life of the future centuries, one realizes that the higher life of the whole race has claims upon those who live in the first decade of the twentieth century. That chief claim is to make large men.

This discussion is made forceful by liberal extracts from the few of the many letters written to me by the heads of great business corporations touching the value of a college training. The first which I submit is from Mr. Hugh J. Chisholm, President of the International Paper Company:

"I regard a man equipped with a college education, two years' technical and two years' law-school training, as the best-equipped material to build upon, if he is entering into and expecting to follow a manufacturing, mercantile, or banking business; and, after a man trained in this way gets the practical knowledge of the business in which he engages, he has a better combination of qualities than the man possessing knowledge acquired from practical encountering or conducting of any of the above referred to lines of business, whose education is confined to that which he has received from the high school. The very serious objection, however, to acquiring such a college education as outlined above, is the time it consumes, assuming that it takes from four to six years as the shortest time possible to so equip a young man. The boy who leaves the high school and commences at once from that point to get practical knowledge of the business or commercial life has certainly an advantage later in life when he encounters the college graduate who is just commencing his business career, and by the lack of this practical technical knowledge the college graduate is

handicapped when brought in competition with the young man who has devoted his time to the learning of the business into which he may have entered. But, assuming that they both possess equal mental and physical ability, in the four or six years following, the college graduate ought to excel the young man whose education has been confined to the high school. In my judgment, the college presidents of the present day have no more serious problem to intelligently and practically work out than that of properly establishing a course of studies in the great colleges of this country which will take into consideration how best to educate and equip that portion of their students who intend to follow a commercial calling rather than a profession, realizing, as every thinking man does to-day, the great demand that has been created for the highest type of intellectual ability, integrity, and executive ability, necessary to manage successfully and honestly the great amount of capital that has been and is being concentrated in the large industrial corporations of this country."

John W. Dunn, President of the International Steam Pump Company, says:

"Although I did not myself enjoy the benefits of a college education, having left school at an early age to go to work for my living, I do not share the prejudice against a college education which is expressed by some of our self-made men. I believe that the theoretical foundation which a young man receives at a well-conducted college can be of great use to him in after life, provided that on leaving college he is willing to begin at the bottom of the ladder to learn practically any business he may choose to enter upon, without bringing with him any false idea that the learning that he has acquired from his books and his professors absolves him from going through precisely the same course of practical training that he would have had to undergo if he had gone directly from school or high school to a shop or factory. We have in our various companies a number of young men who are graduates of the various technical institutes, and whom we are willing to assist in making their way, provided they are content to begin as common operatives, like any ordinary working-man who is to earn his

living. To any young man who is content to take up his work in this frame of mind, I believe that a professional education will be of great value after he has thoroughly mastered the practical details of his work, and familiarized himself with those matters which can only be acquired by actual experience and by actual contact with business and with men. Any young man, however, who is imbued with a belief that because he has gone through college he has nothing further to learn, and is superior to the necessities which those who have had no such advantages are compelled to recognize, will find that his college education is not only of no benefit to him, but is a positive hindrance to his success in life. My observation of young men, in whom I have always taken a great deal of interest, has led me to believe that the main reason why so many college men are not as successful in business as others who have only had the very plainest rudiments of an education is that by reason of the species of conceit to which I have just referred their minds are closed to those sources of instruction and training which they would otherwise gladly avail themselves of, and to which the success of most of our self-made men is in a considerable measure due. I believe that all of our best colleges recognize the truth of what I have just said, and take pains to instil it into the minds of their students. That is to say, they impress upon them that when they leave college they have not learned everything there is to know. but are only on the threshold, and that the advantages they have had over other men will not avail them unless they apply themselves to their business with the same energy, fidelity, and perseverance that those other men habitually employ."

Mr. J. Ogden Armour, of Chicago, through his secretary states:

"That in his opinion, the solution of this question, as far as commercial success is concerned, is not so much one of the abstract value of advanced education, as compared with that obtained in the public schools, as it is of adaptability to the chosen pursuit of the student. He, of course, recognizes the very great value of a complete education, but he thinks it is to be largely measured, in relation to success in commercial

affairs, by the trustworthiness, ambition, and perseverance that accompany it. With these fundamental qualifications, and others which naturally suggest themselves, opportunities for a successful career would unquestionably occur. Mr. Armour's action regarding employees in his own business is practically wholly independent of the possession by them of exceptional educational advantages. He does not, however, desire to underrate the desirability of the highest education possible, but thinks that commercial success is chiefly dependent upon qualifications which may or may not accompany exceptional scholastic attainment."

Mr. Wyerhaeuser, of Wyerhaeuser & Company, of St. Paul, writes:

"The disadvantages under which a college graduate labors when he enters business are that he is pretty well advanced toward manhood, is awkward, has no business training, and is apt to think that because he is a college graduate he ought not to be obliged to commence at the bottom of the ladder and work up, as the office boy does who enters the office when he is fourteen years of age. If he is a man of good sense and does not think too much of his college education, by the time he is forty years of age he has a great many advantages over the boy who left school at eighteen, and it must be a source of great satisfaction to him during his life that he has had the benefit of a college education. I, by all means, would recommend to a boy, who is inclined to study, a course in some good college. He certainly, in the course of time, will find that he is amply repaid for it. The boy who is bright and starts in business after graduating from the high school will, for the first ten years, get along much better and be happier than the man who has spent four or five years attending college, and may have made a good start toward laying the foundation for a profitable business long before the college man gets an insight into the business. Still, I think the college graduate, by the time he reaches seventy, would have had the most satisfactory life, and, perhaps, would be fully as successful as the man who has not been fortunate enough to possess a college education."

Mr. Powell Stackhouse, of the Cambria Steel Company, says:

"I hold that a young man of proper physical and mental balance cannot be overeducated. In the manufacture of steel (and the same is true of any modern manufacturing operations) a thorough technical education is an essential, as without it a limit of advancement will sooner or later be reached. In the commercial line it may not be so essential, but is a great advantage. It is true that there are many notable men who, without the advantages of a technical education, have risen to the top of their profession; these are the exceptions in many thousands, and are only such as have the natural ability, coupled with great perseverance and the self-denial afterward to educate themselves, and they cannot be raised as objections, but as an incentive to a thorough college education. It does not follow by any means that because a young man has passed a college life with credit, he will necessarily be a success in any line he may select. He has only been furnished with the mental tools to work with, and their after application depends upon his use and the opportunities thereby afforded. Any failure of a young man to secure the most advanced education he possibly can must in some time of his future life operate detrimentally."

Such testimonies I might call to great number and length. But enough has been said to prove that the managers of the great business undertakings of the present and of the future will receive large advantage from the college. To the merchant, the manufacturer, and the administrator the college offers an understanding more comprehensive, a sense of relationship more just, as well as a training of the will more adequate for large undertakings. The college helps to create the man of sobermindedness, of personal resolution, who is intent on things of the mind. It aids, let us believe, in nourishing the noblest type of the gentleman. But, while causing these richest personal results, it is also training great executives for the great affairs of the United States and of the world.

XXVII

SPORT

"THE MISSION OF SPORT AND OUTDOOR LIFE"

BY

GROVER CLEVELAND

FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

ONLY recently has the importance of sport been admitted in our philosophy of life. The old tendency was to regard outdoor exercise as a thing of childhood, to be put aside with other childish toys. Now, however, the need of recreation, of refreshment from the overmastering strain of modern effort, becomes increasingly apparent. Youth may easily be too ready to give itself, to expend its forces. It does not count the cost. Hence, in timely warning to young men, comes the following address from one whose devotion to outdoor sports still keeps him young at seventy. This discussion was first published by Mr. Cleveland in The Country Calendar, *now* Country Life in America, *and is here reprinted by permission.*

Our former President's own preference among sports is well known to be for fishing, but he is broad-minded enough to speak with equal enthusiasm of every form of exercise. Whatever brings a man outside himself and his own petty worries, whatever urges him to take a full deep breath of country air, that is so much capital to him; it enhances his powers mentally and morally as well as physically.

I AM sure that it is not necessary for me, at this late day, to dwell upon the fact that I am an enthusiast in my devotion to hunting and fishing, as well as every other kind of outdoor recreation. I am so proud of this devotion that, if my sporting proclivities have at times subjected me to criticism and petty

forms of persecution, I do not harbor the shadow of a desire that my steadfastness shall be looked upon as manifesting the courage of martyrdom. On the contrary, I regard these criticisms and persecutions as nothing more serious than gnat stings suffered on the bank of a stream—vexations to be borne with patience and afterward easily submerged in the memory of abundant delightful accompaniments. Thus, when short fishing excursions, in which I have sought relief from the killing vexations and perplexities of official duty, have been denounced in a mendacious newspaper as dishonest devices to cover scandalous revelry, I have been able to enjoy a sort of pleasurable contempt for the author of this accusation, while congratulating myself on the mental and physical restoration I had derived from these excursions. So, also, when people more mistaken than malicious have wagged their heads in pitying fashion and deprecated my guiltiness of hunting and fishing frivolity in high public service, I have found it easy to lament the neglect of these amiable persons to accumulate for their delectation a fund of charming reminiscences of sport; while, at the same time, I have sadly reflected how their dispositions might have been sweetened and their lives made happier if they had yielded something to the particular type of frivolity which they deplored.

I hope it may not be amiss for me to supplement these personal observations by the direct confession that, so far as my attachment to outdoor sports may be considered as a fault, I am, as related to this especial predicament of guilt, utterly incorrigible and shameless. Not many years ago, while residing in a non-sporting but delightfully cultured and refined community, I found that considerable indignation had been aroused among certain good neighbors and friends, because it had been said of me that I was willing to associate in the field with any loafer who was the owner of a dog and gun. I am sure that I did not in the least undervalue the extreme friendliness of those inclined to intervene in my defence; and yet, at the risk of doing an apparently ungracious thing, I felt inexorably constrained to check their kindly efforts by promptly conceding that the charge was too nearly true to be denied.

There can be no doubt that certain men are endowed with a sort of inherent and spontaneous instinct which leads them to hunting and fishing indulgence as the most alluring and satisfying of all recreations. In this view, I believe it may be safely said that the true hunter or fisherman is born, not made. I believe, too, that those who thus by instinct and birthright belong to the sporting fraternity and are actuated by a genuine sporting spirit, are neither cruel, nor greedy and wasteful of the game and fish they pursue; and I am convinced that there can be no better conservators of the sensible and provident protection of game and fish than those who are enthusiastic in their pursuit, but who, at the same time, are regulated and restrained by a sort of chivalric fairness and generosity, felt and recognized by every true sportsman.

While it is most agreeable thus to consider hunting and fishing as constituting, for those especially endowed for their enjoyment, the most tempting of outdoor sports, it is easily apparent that there is a practical value to these sports as well as all other outdoor recreations, which rests upon a broader foundation. Though the delightful and passionate love for outdoor sports and recreation is not bestowed upon every one as a natural gift, they are so palpably related to health and vigor, and so inseparably connected with the work of life and comfort of existence, that it is happily ordained that a desire or a willingness for their enjoyment may be cultivated to an extent sufficient to meet the requirements of health and self-care. In other words, all but the absolutely indifferent can be made to realize that outdoor air and activity, intimacy with nature and acquaintanceship with birds and animals and fish, are essential to physical and mental strength, under the exactions of an unescapable decree.

> 'For the good God who loveth us
> He made and loveth all.'

Men may accumulate wealth in neglect of this law; but how infinitely much they will forfeit, in the deprivation of wholesome vigor, in the loss of the placid fitness for the quiet joys and comforts of advancing years, and in the displacement of contented age by the demon of querulous and premature decrepitude!

A LAW NOT TO BE DISOBEYED

Men in disobedience of this law may achieve triumph in the world of science, education, and art; but how unsatisfying are the rewards thus gained if they hasten the night when no man can work, and if the later hours of life are haunted by futile regrets for what is still left undone, that might have been done if there had been closer communion with nature's visible forms!

In addition to the delight which outdoor recreations afford to those instinctively in harmony with their enjoyment, and after a recognition of the fact that a knowledge of their nerve and muscle-saving ministrations may be sensibly cultivated, there still remains another large item that should be placed to their credit. Every individual, as a unit in the scheme of civilized social life, owes to every man, woman, and child within such relationship an uninterrupted contribution to the fund of enlivening and pleasurable social intercourse. None of us can deny this obligation; and none of us can discharge it as we ought, if our contributions are made in the questionable coin of sordidness and nature's perversion. Our experience and observation supply abundant proof that those who contribute most generously to the exhilaration and charm of social intercourse will be found among the disciples of outdoor recreation, who are in touch with nature and have thus kept fresh and unperverted a simple love of humanity.

A CHANCE IN THE OPEN FOR ALL

It seems to me that thoughtful men should not be accused of exaggerated fears when they deprecate the wealth-mad rush and struggle of American life and the consequent neglect of outdoor recreation, which impair that mental and physical vigor absolutely essential to our national welfare, abundantly promised to those who gratefully recognize, in nature's adjustment to the wants of man, the care of "the good God" who "made and loveth all."

Manifestly, if outdoor recreations are important to the individual and to the nation, and if there is danger of their

neglect, every instrumentality should be heartily encouraged which aims to create and stimulate their indulgence in every form.

Fortunately, the field is broad and furnishes a choice for all except those wilfully at fault. The sky and sun above the head, the soil beneath the feet, and outdoor air on every side are the indispensable requisites.

XXVIII

THE TOILERS

"LABOR ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES"

BY

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,

PRESIDENT OF CLARK COLLEGE

THE HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, who since 1902 *has been president of the newly founded Clark College in Worcester, Mass., held for nearly twenty years previously the high and arduous office of Labor Commissioner to the United States. Hence no other man could be so well fitted to tell us from an impartial standpoint what are the position and the prospects of the laborer in America.*

This is obviously one of the important problems of to-day and of the future. Of recent years labor has begun to reassert its ancient dignity. Not only in America but throughout Europe the system of labor organization has given the workingman such power that a future begins to seem possible in which his efforts will be required not to assert his own rights but only to restrain himself from trampling on those of others. Some keen eyes, however, begin to see, or believe they see, a coming amelioration of conditions, a practically working harmony between labor and capital, which shall recognize the rights of both. It is in this effort to understand the future of labor by the light of its recent developments that President Wright here lends us his aid.

THERE is little or no evidence of the existence of the modern trade union, so far as recorded facts are concerned, prior to the year 1700. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the principles of trade unionism developed in Great Britain until at the present time the unions are strong, numerous, well-equipped with funds, and generally recognized as important

elements in industrial development. It is rare now to meet an employer in the old country who does not in some degree approve of organized labor. He may deprecate particular methods and insist that organizations encroach upon the rights and responsibilities of employers; but the underlying principle of labor organization is recognized.

A trade union is understood to be an association of wage earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment, and it is this form and for this purpose that the union has existed in England for at least two centuries. It did not spring full-grown into existence, but grew as industry developed. This has been the course, too, in the United States, although the development has not extended over such a range of time. Prior to the establishment of the factory system in the United States there was little labor organization. The factory system was not the cause of organization in England, nor was it particularly the cause of it in the United States; but with the factory system industry itself became more thoroughly organized, and by the concentration of workers helped largely to create the desire for their organization.

The Southern colonies, where the slave system existed prior to the Civil War, did not offer any fertile field for wage earners to agitate the question of organization. The Northern colonies, although having a different system of labor from the South, also offered but little field for labor agitation prior to the establishment of the factory system, because industry was primitive in its nature, land was plentiful, laborers were in demand, and habits and wants were simple. The two systems of labor, slave and free, naturally had their effect in various directions, both in the economics of production and in the relation of the laborer to society. As mechanical industries developed, free labor offered opportunities for movement; yet historically there is not revealed any concerted action of any consequence during the colonial period, except incidentally in the early days in Massachusetts, when the ship caulkers, who were politicians, organized what was known as the "Caulkers' Club," and it is from this name that the American term "caucus" was derived. This club existed in the early part of the eighteenth century,

but in those days the elements of organization were wanting, for organization comes through the aggregation of laborers in industrial centres.

The domestic system of labor also stood in the way of extensive organization. Thus it was not until the opening of the nineteenth century that labor unions began to have any influence in industrial affairs, and their influence was very slight until after the first quarter of that century had passed. In 1806 the Tailors' Union was established, partly for trade purposes but largely on account of political interests, as the tailors had always been participants in political matters. This association grew from the influence exerted by members of the craft coming from England, who preserved their loyalty to the Journeymen Tailors' Unions of the old country. The hatters had an organization in 1819, and the shipwrights and caulkers established an order in 1822, under the name of the "Columbian Charitable Society of Shipwrights and Caulkers of Boston and Charlestown." This organization was chartered by the legislature of Massachusetts in 1823. An association called the "New York Society of Journeymen Shipwrights" was incorporated in the city of New York in 1803, while the house carpenters of the same city organized in 1806. It is probable that the compositors of New York were organized in the earliest years of the last century, for in 1817 they had a society known as the "New York Typographical Society," with Peter Force as its president.

With the year 1825, on account of new elements and purposes which appeared at that time, the development of the labor movement took on new force. No single cause for the spirit of that year can be assigned. There were many reasons for it, among which were the demand for shorter hours of labor and for higher wages, a desire to experiment in co-operation, and the spirit of association, which rapidly developed through the influence of the altruistic preachings of Robert Owen, who came to America in 1824. A wave of socialistic doctrines, which may well be called the transcendentalism of industry, swept over the country. Fourier and others helped to feed this spirit, and very many socialist experiments were inaugu-

rated, more than two hundred communistic villages having been founded as the result of the doctrines taught by Charles Fourier. So the period from 1825 to 1850 may be called a period of reform movements, all having more or less influence on the spirit of organization, which spirit extended to the wage earners.

The rapidly developing factory system, the very essence of which is the principle of association, added economic force to the general reform movements, and after 1825 unions began to be formed everywhere in the Northern States, accompanied by an agitation for legislation for workingmen, Boston and New York being the most prominent centres of all the movements. Naturally, labor literature appeared, and in 1825 the *Working Man's Advocate* was published in the city of New York. This publication was followed by the *Daily Sentinel* and *Young America*, all published by two Englishmen, George Henry Evans and Frederick W. Evans, who came to America in 1820.

In 1830 a workingmen's convention was held at Syracuse, in the State of New York, which convention put up a candidate for Governor. The next year the movers, under the name of the "Working Men's Party," united with the Whigs, and succeeded in electing three or four members of the legislature. An important convention was held in Boston on the 16th of February, 1831, consisting of farmers, mechanics, and other workingmen. Out of this meeting grew a delegate convention, held in 1832, in September. This convention discussed land interests, taxation, and co-operative trading. Many of its demands were similar to those advanced by the Evans brothers. The Hon. Edward Everett, afterward Minister to the Court of St. James's, commended the organization of the Working Men's Party as represented in the convention of Boston. Other meetings were held in that city, at which it was recommended that the mechanics of all branches should hold meetings by themselves for the purpose of consulting together and of doing all possible things to enable them to come to a mutual agreement upon the system of working hours. The right of laborers to organize for the purpose of securing and protecting their interests

and the question as to whether general trade unions would diminish strikes and lock-outs were also prominent in all the discussions. Following these meetings in the city of Boston in the years 1831 and 1832, the General Trades Unions of the City of New York were active in discussing the same questions, and this is the first attempt, so far as the history of the development of industry is concerned, to unite workingmen of different trades in one organization. In later years this attempt was repeated by the Knights of Labor.

The agitation for organization during the years following those just named took various forms, and in some cases the employers took part in the matter from their point of view. At a meeting held in the Exchange Coffee Rooms on the 15th of May, 1832, the merchants and shipowners voted to "discountenance and check the unlawful combination formed to control the freedom of individuals as to the hours of labor, and to thwart and embarrass those by whom they are employed and liberally paid." The meeting also pointed out what it considered to be "the pernicious and demoralizing tendency of these combinations and the unreasonableness of the attempt, in particular where mechanics are held in so high estimation and their skill in labor so liberally rewarded." The capitalists and other employers in their assembly at that time held that labor ought always to be left free to regulate itself, and that neither the employee nor the employer should have the power to control the other, and they looked with deep regret upon any course designed to coerce individuals and to prescribe the time and manner of labor. The employers announced that labor organizations would drive trade from the city, and they passed a resolution pledging themselves to "neither employ any journeyman who at the time belongs to such combinations, nor give work to any master mechanic who shall employ them while they continue thus pledged to each other." In this resolution 106 firms joined.

From this statement it will be seen that seventy-five years ago there was as much opposition to the organization of labor in America as existed in the old country, but as the country grew accustomed to labor organizations it learned to consider them

as helpful in many ways, and that they were not antagonistic to proper development. The American people, like the English, realized that trade unionism represented a struggle for improvement, and that it ought not to be subjected to legal disabilities, nor considered with suspicion, nor brought under harsh investigation, nor subjected to persecution. A larger knowledge, a wider sympathy, caused the American people to realize that, in spite of antagonism, disabilities, and suspicion, the most intelligent and industrious artisans of the country were making great efforts to aid in the upward struggle, and to enable the workmen to meet the great exigencies resulting from sickness, accident, old age, disability, irregularity of employment, death, and the destitution of widows and orphans. Hostility ceased in a great measure. The courts became more friendly, and instead of declaring all organizations to be conspiracies, as was the habit in the earlier part of the century, they gradually took the ground that organizations were legitimate, and that the efforts to secure increased remuneration were not efforts to restrain trade; and the unions were therefore able, after a somewhat tedious contest covering more than a quarter of a century, to throw off legal disabilities and take their place among modern institutions as a recognized force in the public welfare, and there they remain.

The general understanding at the present time is that combinations, either of labor or of capital as such, are not essentially objects of distrust, evils to be throttled, or diseases to be eradicated from the economic system, and with this understanding comes the recognition of the truth that unregulated competition is the law of death and not of life; that it means everywhere the survival of the unfit—the unfit employer as well as the unfit employee, and the unfit type of industrial organization, whether of employees or employers. The people are learning that combination is the inevitable result of efforts to escape suicidal conditions of unregulated competition of all forms, whether it be the destructive competition of producers fighting each other in the dark for custom, or the hungry competition of workmen fighting each other in the dark for the custom of employers—the opportunity to earn a proper remuneration.

This brief historical view of labor organization in the United States shows that it constitutes an integral part of our industrial development and is really an influential feature of industrial achievement. Since 1825 the history of trade unionism is a progressive one. Out of the earlier combinations there have grown some great associations or organizations, developing power and bringing to the attention of the country conditions which need reform and relations which call for the highest ethical influence to secure their proper adjustment; and it is sufficient in this place to say that, no matter what the opposition of any particular period was or the character it assumed, no matter what antagonisms within disturbed the order of development, no matter how defections reduced the ranks of unionism at times, and jealousies prevented success, labor organizations have continued through success and failure, and their propaganda have extended first to all great interests and ultimately to all parts of the land.

Among trade unionists there are three types of unions recognized—the local, the national, and the international. The typical local union is made up entirely of members who live and work in one town or one restricted locality, and its business is conducted in the democratic way, by a vote of all the members meeting in one place. The national and international unions really constitute but a single type, though the formal distinction between them is carefully preserved in all trade-union literature. The typical national union aims at bringing under one control the workers in its trade in the United States, while the international union, so called, draws into its constituency the local unions of the United States, Canada, and sometimes Mexico. Local unions are the constituent elements of national and international unions, and the voting is done by delegates. Most of the national trade unions are affiliated to one great federal organization, known as the American Federation of Labor. The railway brotherhoods, so called, keep their separate organizations without affiliating to any other body. There are some independent unions, while the Knights of Labor are a body entirely distinct from all other organizations and have a different organic law.

It is difficult to ascertain the membership of unions. In Great Britain the law requiring registration enables the Government to state with fair accuracy the strength of unions in that country. According to the latest reports available, the English trade unions had a membership of 1,802,518, while in the United States, with double England's population, the estimated membership of labor organizations on July 1st last was 1,400,000. It is estimated at the present time that there are nearly 18,000,000 persons (men, women, and children) in the United States working as wage earners. The percentage embraced in the labor unions is not large, therefore, being not more than 8 per cent. of the whole body. It must be remembered, however, that in many trades the members are organized up to a large proportion, sometimes 90 per cent. of the total number engaged.

The American Federation of Labor probably represents at the present time 850,000 members, while it is claimed that the Knights of Labor have a membership of nearly 200,000. Some years ago this latter organization numbered nearly 1,000,000. The Order of Railway Conductors of America has nearly 25,000 members, the Brotherhod of Locomotive Engineers over 34,000, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen nearly 38,000, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen about 44,000, while the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, the Switchmen's Union of North America, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and the Brotherhood of Railway Trackmen, whose membership has not been recently reported, all constitute influential organizations. All these organizations, with some independent bodies, make up the total stated—about 1,400,000.

The objects of most trade unions are well represented in the declaration of the Federation of Labor, which demands eight hours as a day's work, favors the national and state incorporation of unions, urges the obligatory education of children and the prohibition of employment under the age of 14, calls for the enactment of uniform franchise laws, and opposes contract convict labor and the truck system of payment of wages. If favors the adoption of employers' liability acts, and generally indorses the claims of trade unionism everywhere.

Trade unionism represents the interests of specific trades.

The principles underlying the tenets of the Knights of Labor ignore specific vocations and seek to harmonize all individual or separate interests in the interests of the whole, the declared aim of the order being to secure to the workers of society the fullest enjoyment of the wealth they are supposed to create and leisure for the development of intellectual, moral, and social faculties. Many of the tenets of the Knights of Labor are similar to those of trade unionism, and they demand the incorporation of labor organizations, as do the unionists. All orders in America favor industrial arbitration and are practically opposed to compulsory arbitration.

The Order of the Knights of Labor is more socialistic than the American Federation of Labor, but both have made some declaration in the direction of government ownership. For many years there has been a contest for control by the socialistic members of the latter body, but so far the Federation has been conservative, and with one exception has resisted successfully all attempts to make a socialistic organization of it.

Some of the large unions have funds of considerable amount. One of the best representative orders in this respect is the Cigar-makers' International Union, with a membership of nearly 34,000. During twenty-one years this order paid in benefits $4,737,550.

The objects of all organizations are peaceful and moral and do not invite antagonism, but when it comes to action, then men differ not only as to the value of the work of organized labor but as to the legitimacy of its purpose. As a rule, trade unions are opposed to strikes, and they declare themselves not in sympathy with the strike method of enforcing demands. They, of course, insist upon the right to strike, and the courts sustain this right. It is the almost universal attitude of courts in the United States that if one man can leave his employment, two or more may do so, and that there can be no restriction upon this privilege. The courts hold, however, as they do in England, that intimidation and violence must not accompany strikes, and that the strikers themselves, in indulging in these things, are amenable to criminal law. Strikes are no longer considered as conspiracies, however.

During the twenty years closing December 31, 1900, there had occurred in the United States 22,793 strikes, involving 117,509 establishments. Of these strikes, 50.77 per cent. succeeded, 13.04 per cent. succeeded partly, and 36.19 per cent. failed. Labor organizations ordered 14,457, or 63 per cent. of all the strikes occurring during the period, and of those ordered by organizations 52.86 per cent. succeeded, 13.60 per cent. partially succeeded, and 33.54 per cent., or about one-third of all the strikes ordered by organizations, failed. From these data is seen the practical influence of labor organizations in their attitude toward strikes.

To-day the most prominent leaders of all labor organizations are joining hands with broad-minded employers everywhere in efforts to adopt the joint-committee method of settling disputes. They are learning from the experience of the mother country that it is better to have such joint conciliation committees, before whom all grievances can be laid as soon as they arise and by whom they can be talked over in a friendly but interested way. Our most intelligent captains of industry are thoroughly alive to this view, and in connection with organized labor they have a grand opportunity to accomplish results that shall be beneficial to themselves and to the community.

Probably these efforts will be facilitated through the incorporation of trade unions. There is nothing in the laws of any of the States of the Union that prevents such incorporation; nevertheless but few organizations have taken advantage of the laws allowing incorporation. In the State of New York there are a few incorporated unions, but as a rule unionists are fearful of the results of incorporation. They fear that their funds may be attached whenever members of a union commit overt acts and thus subject them to suits for damages, and that whenever a decree of a court should be against a union, the result would be a loss of the charter and disintegration of the organization. In all probability they would stand better as incorporated bodies—entities in the eyes of the law—than they do as voluntary organizations.

The decisions of the American courts relative to the liability of strikers in what is known as picketing are similar in tenor

to those which have been made by the courts of England. The real question is whether strikers should be enjoined against maintaining patrols or any form of picket to prevent non-union men from entering the works of an establishment under strike, or from preventing the employer from carrying on his business unless he shall do certain things which have been demanded of him. The courts have no hesitancy in declaring that where picketing is accompanied by intimidation or force the parties organizing or directing such force or intimidation are liable under criminal law. There are also some decisions declaring that picketing itself is a menace, and hence an intimidation, and therefore illegal. There has been no decision, however, as far reaching as that in the Taff Vale railway case, recently decided by the House of Lords. The doctrine laid down by the Law Lords, however—that any organization that can work an injury must be held responsible for the damages resulting therefrom—will undoubtedly receive attention in America.

Unions are very much opposed to the modern method of restraint through injunctions, and complain of the expansion of the injunction, under which strikers are warned to refrain from doing things which if done would be crimes under statutory law and punishable accordingly. They insist that, should they be accused of any violence, they should be allowed trial as criminals or breakers of the law by a jury in the ordinary way, when they can have, under the bills of rights as they exist in the United States, the privilege of facing accusers and bringing forward evidence in their defence. Many eminent jurists feel that the expanded use of injunctions in late years is not in accordance with the strictest equity, but the difficulty lies in modifying by legislation some of the principles involved at common law in the writ of injunction.

Trade unionists have undertaken to secure recognition through a system known as collective bargaining, the adoption of sliding scales being a feature of this work. Collective bargaining has also been indorsed in many cases by employers, but occasionally, as in the great Homestead strike in 1892 and some other labor conflicts, the scale has been a prominent

cause of difficulty. Employers sometimes resent the idea of collective bargaining, because in carrying it out there must be a recognition of the union. Men like Mr. John Pierpont Morgan, however, prefer to deal with well organized and administered trade unions as the medium through which to arrange questions of wages and other conditions of employment, rather than to subject themselves to the chaotic and unreliable results which are found when workmen act as individuals.

The great organizations are growing more and more conservative, especially those represented in the American Federation of Labor, which was organized permanently in December, 1886, under its present name. The country at large owes a debt to this order which is not always or very generally recognized. At the time of the great strike in Chicago in 1894, when the American Railway Union, the order that organized the strike, demanded a general or sympathetic strike of all mechanics and artisans, the executive committee of the American Federation defeated this purpose, and no general strike occurred. Again, in the great steel strike of 1901, when the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers thought that by a general strike, sympathetic in its nature in a sense, they would be able to win against the powerful United States Steel Corporation, the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor declined to advise a general strike. In all probability this action had as much to do with bringing the strike to an end as any one element.

Of course, organized labor has received many very severe blows. The rapid decrease in membership and influence of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers on account of the disorders at Homestead in 1892 is a very striking instance in this direction. The same association lost, in a way, again in 1901, but on the whole it has been progressive, and now, by wise management, its position since the strike is encouraging. Unions come and unions go, but the most powerful and influential have a long and honorable history, although conservatism and wise action have often been the result of radical, extreme, and dangerous methods.

Probably the best known, and in a popular sense the wisest, union in the country is the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. This organization has exerted a sure and steadying influence in various controversies. Its members are called by the members of other unions the aristocracy of labor, but they came to their present enviable position through some of the extremest efforts to carry their points that have been made in this country. Their wisdom is the wisdom of experience, and the managers of the brotherhood have been wise enough to recognize experience. Other organizations are benefiting by such experience, and as time goes on they will exert a still greater influence in the industrial field. Unions are, as a rule, friendly to machinery, studying practical, economic questions, and are not drags upon industry. The exceptions to this rule are now so few that they need not be considered.

When the greatest capitalists of the country are ready to recognize and deal with unions, and to advocate the advantages, through conciliatory methods, which can come only through organizations, and to meet the leaders of labor unions in great conferences, as they have done recently, for the discussion of vital economic and moral questions, there need not be much fear of antagonism. The old suspicious attitude toward trade unions in the United States is practically a thing of the past.

XXIX

THE SOIL

"LAND AND ITS OWNERSHIP IN THE PAST"

BY

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE

PRESIDENT OF THE LAND NATURALIZATION SOCIETY

THAT the twentieth century will see radical changes in our social order every thoughtful man agrees. How these changes are to be accomplished, whether slowly and carefully under the guidance of accepted and far-seeing leaders, or suddenly and tumultuously under pressure of bursting bonds, that no man can say with surety. Powerful interests oppose themselves to hard necessities.

Close allied with the question of the future of labor is the question of the future of land. Henry George eloquently preached to us the "single tax" which should make the land, the soil itself, pay for everything. Somewhat in harmony with these views are those of Mr. Wallace, LL.D., F.R.S., whose age and whose high reputation as being, with Darwin, the codiscoverer of evolution, lend value to his every utterance. Such a man does not speak heedlessly, and when even Mr. Wallace declares that there is something radically wrong with our social order, that justice demands and will ultimately enforce a readjustment of all our conceptions of property, surely it is time that we take thought.

DURING many past centuries of oppression and wrong there has been an ever-present but rarely expressed cry for redress, for some small instalment of justice to the downtrodden workers. It has been the aspiration alike of the peasant and the philosopher, of the poet and the saint. But the rule of the lords of the soil has ever been so hard, and

supported by power so overwhelming and punishment so severe, that the born thralls or serfs have rarely dared to do more than humbly petition for some partial relief; or, if roused to rebel by unbearable misery and wrongs, they have soon been crushed by the power of mailed knights and armed retainers. The peasant revolt at the end of the fourteenth century was to gain relief from the oppressive serfdom that was enforced after the black death had diminished the number of workers. John Ball then preached socialism for the first time.

"By what right," he said, "are they whom we call lords greater folk than we? Why do they hold us in serfage? . . . They are clothed in velvet, while we are covered with rags. They have wine and spices and fair bread; and we oat-cake and straw, and water to drink. They have leisure and fine houses; we have pain and labor, the rain and the wind in the fields. And yet it is of us and our toil that these men hold their state."

John Ball and Wat Tyler lived five hundred years too soon. To-day the very same claims are made by men who, having got political power, cannot be so easily suppressed.

A century passed, and the great martyr of freedom, Sir Thomas More, powerfully set forth the wrongs of the workers and the crimes of their rulers in his ever-memorable "Utopia." Near the end of this work he thus summarizes the governments of his time in words that will apply almost, if not quite, as accurately to-day:

"Is not that government both unjust and ungrateful that is so prodigal of its favors to those that are called gentlemen, or such others who are idle, or live either by flattery or by contriving the arts of vain pleasure, and, on the other hand, takes no care of those of a meaner sort, such as ploughmen, colliers, and smiths, without whom we could not subsist? But after the public has reaped all the advantage of their service and they come to be oppressed with age, sickness, and want, all their labors and the good they have done is forgotten, and all the recompense given them is that they are left to die in great misery. The richer sort are often endeavoring to bring the hire of laborers lower—not only by their fraudulent practices, but by the

laws which they procure to be made to that effect; so that though it is a thing most unjust in itself to give such small rewards to those who deserve so well of the public, yet they have given those hardships the name and color of justice, by procuring laws to be made for regulating them.

"Therefore I must say that, as I hope for mercy, I can have no other notion of all the governments that I see or know than that they are a conspiracy of the rich, who, on pretence of managing the public, only pursue their private ends, and devise all the ways and arts they can find out; first, that they may, without danger, preserve all that they have so ill acquired, and then that they may engage the poor to toil and labor for them at as low rates as possible, and oppress them as much as they please."[1]

Here we have a stern demand for justice to the workers who produce all the wealth of the rich, as clearly and as forcibly expressed as by any of our modern socialists. Sir Thomas More might, in fact, be well taken as the hero and patron saint of socialism.

A century passed away before Bacon in England, and Campanelli in Italy, again set forth schemes of social regeneration. Bacon's "New Atalantis" supposed that the desired improvement would come from man's increased command over the powers of nature, which would give wealth enough for all. We have, however, obtained this command to a far greater extent than Bacon could possibly have anticipated; yet its chief social effect has been the increase of luxury and the widening of the gulf between rich and poor. Although material wealth, reckoned not in money but in things, has increased perhaps twenty or thirty fold in the last century, while the population has little more than doubled, yet millions of our people still live in the most wretched penury, the whole vast increase of wealth having gone to increase the luxury and waste of the rich and the comfort of the middle classes.

Campanelli, more far-sighted than Bacon, saw the need of social justice as well as increased knowledge, and proposed a system of refined communism. But all these ideas were

[1] Cassell's National Library, *Utopia*, p. 17

but as dreams of a golden age, and had no influence whatever in ameliorating the condition of the workers, which, with minor fluctuations, and having due regard to the progress of material civilization, may be said to have remained practically unchanged for the last three centuries. When one-fourth of all the deaths in London occur in workhouses and hospitals, notwithstanding that four millions are spent there annually in public charity, while untold thousands die in their wretched cellars and attics from the direct or indirect effects of starvation, cold, and unhealthy surroundings; and while all these terrible facts are repeated proportionately in all our great manufacturing towns, it is simply impossible that, within the time I have mentioned, the condition of the workers as a whole can have been much, if any, worse than it is now.

At the end of the seventeenth, and during the eighteenth century, a new school of reformers arose, of whom Locke, Rousseau, and Turgot were representatives. They saw the necessity of a fundamental justice, especially as regards land, the source of all wealth. Locke declared that labor gave the only just title to land; while Rousseau was the author of the maxim that the produce of the land belongs to all men, the land itself to no one. The first Englishman, however, who saw clearly the vast importance of the land question, and who laid down those principles with regard to it which are now becoming widely accepted, was an obscure Newcastle schoolmaster, Thomas Spence, who in 1775 gave a lecture before the Philosophical Society of that town, which was so much in advance of the age that when he printed his lecture the society expelled him, and he was soon afterward obliged to leave the town. He maintained the sound doctrine that the land of any country or district justly belongs to those who live upon it, not to any individuals to the exclusion of the rest; and he points out, as did Herbert Spencer at a later period, the logical result of admitting private property in land. He says:

"And any one of them (the landlords) still can, by laws of their own making, oblige every living creature to remove off his property (which, to the great distress of mankind, is too often put in execution); so, of consequence, were all the

landholders to be of one mind, and determined to take their properties into their own hands, all the rest of mankind might go to heaven if they could, for there would be no place found for them here. Thus men may not live in any part of this world, not even where they are born, but as strangers, and by the permission of the pretender to the property thereof."

He maintained that every parish should have possession of its own land, to be let out to the inhabitants, and that each parish should govern itself and be interfered with as little as possible by the central government, thus anticipating the views as to local self-government which we are now beginning to put into practice.

A few years later, in 1782, Professor Ogilvie published anonymously "An Essay on the Right of Property in Land, with respect to its foundation in the Law of Nature, its present establishment by the Municipal Laws of Europe, and the Regulations by which it might be rendered more beneficial to the lower Ranks of Mankind." This small work contains an elaborate and well-reasoned exposition of the whole land question, anticipating the arguments of Herbert Spencer in "Social Statics," of Mill, and of the most advanced modern land reformers. But all these ideas were before their time, and produced little or no effect on public opinion. The workers were too ignorant, too much oppressed by the struggle for bare existence, while the middle classes were too short-sighted to be influenced by theoretical views which even to this day many of the most liberal thinkers seem unable fully to appreciate. But the chief cause that prevented the development of sound views on the vital problems of the land and of social justice was, undoubtedly, that men's minds were forcibly directed toward the great struggles for political freedom then in progress. The success of the American revolutionists and the establishment of a republic founded on a Declaration of the Rights of Man, followed by the great French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, entirly obscured all lesser questions, and also led to a temporary and fictitious prosperity, founded on a gigantic debt the burden of which still oppresses us. These great events

irresistibly led to the discussion of questions of political and personal freedom rather than to those deeper problems of social justice of which we are now only beginning to perceive the full importance. The rapid growth of the use of steam power, the vast extension of our manufactures, and the rise of our factory system with its attendant horrors of woman and infant labor, crowded populations, spread of disease, and increase of mortality, loudly cried for palliation and restrictive legislation, and thus occupied much of the attention of philanthropists and politicians.

CHARACTER OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY LEGISLATION

Owing to this combination of events, the nineteenth century has been almost wholly devoted to two classes of legislation—the one directed to reform and popularize the machinery of government itself, the other to neutralize or palliate the evils arising from the unchecked powers of landlords and capitalists in their continual efforts to increase their wealth while almost wholly regardless of the life-shortening labor, the insanitary surroundings, and the hopeless misery of the great body of the workers. To the first class belong the successive Reform Bills, the adoption of the ballot in elections for members of Parliament, household and lodger suffrage, improved registration, and the repression of bribery. To the second, restriction of children's and women's labor in factories and mines, government inspection of these industries; attempts to diminish the dangers of unhealthy employments, and to check the ever-increasing pollution of rivers; the new poor law, casual wards, and other attempts to cope with pauperism; while various fiscal reforms, such as the abolition of the corn laws and the extension of free trade, though advocated in the supposed interest of the wage earners, were really carried by the efforts of great capitalists and manufacturers as a means of extending their foreign trade. Later on came the Elementary Education Act of 1870, which was thought by many to be the crowning of the edifice, and to complete all that could be done by legislation to bring about the well-being of the workers, and, through them, of the whole community.

ITS OUTCOME

Now that we have had nearly a century of the two classes of legislation here referred to, it may be well briefly to take stock of its general outcome, and see how far it has secured—what all such legislation aims at securing—a fair share to all the workers of the mass of wealth they annually produce; a sufficiency of food, clothing, houseroom, and fuel; healthy surroundings; and some amount of leisure and surplus means for the lesser enjoyments of life. And it must be remembered that never in the whole course of human history has there been a century which has added so much to man's command over the forces of nature, and which has so enormously extended his power of creating and distributing all forms of wealth. Steam, gas, photography, and electricity, in all their endless applications, have given us almost unlimited power to obtain all necessaries, comforts, and luxuries that the world can supply us with. It has been calculated that the labor-saving machinery of all kinds now in use produces about a hundred times the result that could be produced if our workers had only the tools and appliances available a century ago. But even in the last century, not only was there produced a sufficiency of food, clothing, and houses for all workers, but an enormous surplus, which was appropriated by the landlords and other capitalists for their own consumption, while large numbers, then as now, were unprofitably employed in ministering to the luxury of the rich, or wastefully and wickedly employed in destroying life and property in civil or foreign wars.

Taking first the anti-capitalistic or social legislation, we find that, though the horrible destruction of the health, the happiness, and the very lives of factory children has been largely reduced, there has grown up in our great cities a system of child labor as cruel and destructive, if not quite so extensive. Infants of four years and upward are employed at matchbox making and similar employments to assist in supporting the family. A widow and two children, working all day and much of the night, can only earn a shilling or eighteenpence from which to pay rent and support life. Children of school age have thus often to work till midnight after having had five hours' school-

ing; and till quite recently a poor mother in this state of penury was fined if she did not send the children to school and pay a penny daily for each, meaning so much less bread for herself or for the children. Of course for the children this is physical and mental destruction. The number of women thus struggling for a most miserable living—often a mere prolonged starvation —is certainly greater than at any previous period of our history, and even if the proportion of the population thus employed is somewhat less—and this is doubtful—the fact that the actual mass of human misery and degradation of this kind is absolutely greater is a horrible result of a century's remedial legislation, together with an increase of national wealth altogether unprecedented.

Again if we turn to the amount of poverty and pauperism as a measure of the success of remedial legislation combined with a vast extension of private and systematized charity, we shall have cause for still more serious reflection. In 1888 the Registrar-General called attention to the fact that both throughout the country and to a still greater extent in London deaths in workhouses, hospitals, and other public charitable institutions had been steadily increasing since 1875. A reference to the Annual Summaries of deaths in London shows the increase to have been continuous from 1860 to 1895, the five-year periods giving the following results:

In 1860–65 of total deaths in London,			16.2	per cent.	occurred in charitable institutions.
1866–70 (no material at hand).					
1871–75 of total deaths in London,			17.4	"	"
1876–80	"	"	18.6	"	"
1881–85	"	"	21.1	"	"
1886–90	"	"	23.4	"	"
1891–95	"	"	26.7	"	"

When we add to this the admitted facts, that organized charity greatly increased during the same period, while the press still teems with records of the most terrible destitution, of suicides from the dread of starvation, and deaths directly caused or indirectly due to want, we are brought face to face

with a mass of human wretchedness that is absolutely appalling in its magnitude. And all this time Royal and Parliamentary Commissions have been inquiring and reporting, Mansion House and other committees have been collecting funds and relieving distress at every exceptional period of trouble, emigration has been actively at work, improved dwellings have been provided, and education has been systematically urged on, with the final result that one-fourth of all the deaths in the richest city in the world occur in workhouses, hospitals, etc., and, in addition, unknown thousands die in their miserable garrets and cellars from various forms of slow or rapid starvation.

Can a state of society which leads to this result be called civilization? Can a government which, after a century of continuous reforms and gigantic labors and struggles, is unable to organize society so that every willing worker may earn a decent living be called a successful government? Is it beyond the wit of man to save a large proportion of one of the most industrious peoples in the world, inhabiting a rich and fertile country, from grinding poverty or absolute starvation? Is it impossible so to arrange matters that a sufficient portion of the wealth they create may be retained by the workers, even if the idle rich have a little less of profuse and wasteful luxury?

THE IMPOTENCE OF OUR LEGISLATORS

Our legislators, our economists, our religious teachers, almost with one voice tell the people that any better organization of society than that which we now possess is impossible. That we must go on as we have been going on, patching here, altering there, now mitigating the severity of a distressing symptom, now slightly clipping the wings of the landlord, the capitalist, or the sweater; but never going down to the root of the evil; never interfering with vested interests in ancestral wrong; never daring to do anything which shall diminish rent and interest and profit, and to the same extent increase the reward of labor; never seek out the fundamental injustice which deprives men of their birthright in their native land, and enables a small number of landlords to tax the rest of the community to the amount of hundreds of millions for permission to culti-

vate and live upon the soil in the country of their birth. Can we, then, wonder that both workers and thinkers are getting tired of all this hopeless incapacity in their rulers? That, possessing education which has made them acquainted with the works of great writers on these matters, from Sir Thomas More to Robert Owen, from Henry George to Edward Bellamy, from Karl Marx to Carlyle and Ruskin; and possessing as they do ability, and honesty, and determination, fully equal to that of the coterie of landlords and capitalists which has hitherto governed them, they are determined, as soon as may be, to govern themselves.

THE WORK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Now, I believe that the great work of the past century, that which is the true preparation for the work to be done in the twentieth century, is not its well-meant and temporarily useful but petty and tentative social legislation, but rather that gradual reform of the political machine—to be completed, it is to be hoped, within the next few years—which will enable the most thoughtful and able and honest among the manual workers to at once turn the balance of political power, and, at no distant period, to become the real and permanent rulers of the country. The very idea of such a government will excite a smile of derision or a groan of horror among the classes who have hitherto blundered and plundered at their will, and have thought they were Heaven-inspired rulers. But I feel sure that the workers will do very much better; and, forming as they do the great majority of the people, it is only bare justice that, after centuries of misgovernment by the idle and wealthy, they should have their turn. The larger part of the invention that has enriched the country has come from the workers; much of scientific discovery has also come from their ranks; and it is certain that, given equality of opportunity, they would fully equal, in every high mental and moral characteristic, the bluest blood in the nation. In the organization of their trades unions and co-operative societies, no less than in their choice of the small body of their fellow-workers who represent them in Parliament, they show that they are in no way inferior

in judgment and in organizing power to the commercial, the literary, or the wealthy classes. The way in which, during the past few years, they have forced their very moderate claims upon the notice of the public, have secured advocates in the press and in Parliament, and have led both political economists and politicians to accept measures which were not long before scouted as utterly beyond the sphere of practical politics, shows that they have already become a power in the state. Looking forward, then, to a government by workers and largely in the interest of workers, at a not distant date, I propose to set forth a few principles and suggestions as to the course of legislation calculated to abolish pauperism, poverty, and enforced idleness, and thus lay the foundation for a true civilization which will be beneficial to all.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REAL REFORMS

That the ownership of large estates in land by private individuals is an injustice to the workers and the source of much of their poverty and misery, is held by all the great writers I have alluded to, and has been fully demonstrated in many volumes. It has led directly to the depopulation of the rural districts, the abnormal growth of great cities, the diminished cultivation of the soil and reduced food supply, and is thus at once a social evil and a national danger. Some petty attempts are now making to restore the people to the land, but in a very imperfect manner. The first and highest use of our land is to provide healthy and happy homes, where all who desire it may live in permanent security and produce a considerable portion of the food required by their families. Every other consideration must give way to this one, and all restrictions on its realization must be abolished. Hence, the first work of the people's Parliament should be to give to the Parish and District Councils unrestricted power to take all land necessary for this purpose, so as to afford every citizen the freest possible choice of a home in which he can live absolutely secure (so long as he pays the very moderate ground rent) and reap the full reward of his labor. Every man, in his turn, should be able to choose both where he will live and how

much land he desires to have, since each one is the best judge of how much he can enjoy and make profitable. Our object is that all workingmen should succeed in life, should be able to live well and happily, and provide for an old age of comfort and repose. Every such landholder is a gain and a safety instead of a loss and a danger to the community, and no outcry, either of existing landlords or of tenants of large farms, must be allowed to stand in their way. The well-being of the community is the highest law, and no private interests can be permitted to prevent its realization. When land can be thus obtained, co-operative communities, on the plan so clearly laid down by Mr. Herbert V. Mills in his work on "Poverty and the State" may also be established, and various forms of co-operative manufacture can be tried.

THE INVIOLABILITY OF THE HOME

But until this great reform can be effected there is a smaller and less radical measure of relief to all tenants, which should at once be advocated and adopted by the Liberal party. It is an old boast that the Englishman's house is his castle, but never was a boast less justified by facts. In a large number of cases a workingman's house might be better described as an instrument of torture, by means of which he can be forced to comply with his landlord's demands, and both in religion and politics submit himself entirely to the landlord's will. So long as the agricultural laborer, the village mechanic, and the village shopkeeper are the tenants of the landowner, the parson, or the farmer, religious freedom or political independence is impossible. And when those employed in factories or workshops are obliged to live, as they so often are, in houses which are the property of their employers, that employer can force his will upon them by the double threat of loss of employment and loss of a home. Under such conditions a man possesses neither freedom nor safety, nor the possibility of happiness, except so far as his landlord and employer thinks proper. A secure HOME is the very first essential alike of political freedom, of personal security, and of social well-being.

Now that every worker, even to the hitherto despised and

down-trodden agricultural laborer, has been given a share in local self-government, it is time that, so far as affects the inviolability of the home, the landlord's power should be at once taken away from him. This is the logical sequence of the creation of Parish Councils. For to declare that it is for the public benefit that every inhabitant of a parish shall be free to vote and to be chosen as a representative by his fellow-parishioners, and at the same time to leave him at the mercy of the individual who owns his house to punish him in a most cruel manner for using the privileges thus granted him, is surely the height of unreason and injustice. It is giving a stone in place of bread; the shadow rather than the substance of political enfranchisement.

There is, however, a very simple and effectual way of rendering tenants secure, and that is by a short Act of Parliament declaring all evictions, or seizure of household goods, other than for non-payment of rent, to be illegal. And to prevent the landlord from driving away a tenant by raising his rent to an impossible amount, all alterations of rent must be approved of as reasonable by a committee of the Parish or District Council, and be determined on the application of either the tenant or the landlord. Of course, at the first letting of a house the landlord could ask what rent he pleased, and if it was exorbitant he would get no tenant. But, having once let it, the tenant should be secure as long as he wished to occupy it, and the rent should not be raised except as allowed by some competent tribunal. No doubt a claim will be made on behalf of the landlords for a compulsory, not voluntary, tenancy on the part of the tenant; that is, that if the tenant has security of occupation, the landlord should have equal security of having a tenant. But the two cases are totally different. Eviction from his home may be, and often is, ruinous loss and misery to the tenant, who is therefore, to avoid such loss, often compelled to submit to the landlord's will. But who ever heard of a tenant, by the threat of giving notice to quit, compelling his landlord to vote against his conscience, or to go to chapel instead of to church? The tenant needs protection, the landlord does not.

The same result might perhaps be gained by giving the Parish and District Councils power to take over all houses whose tenants are threatened with eviction, or with an unfair increase of rent; but this would involve so many complications and would so burden these Councils with new and responsible work, that there is no chance of its being enacted for many years. But the plan of giving a legal permanent tenure to every tenant is so simple, so obviously reasonable, and so free from all interference with the fair money value of the landlord's property, that, with a little energy and persistent agitation, it might possibly be carried in two or three years. Such an Act might be more or less in the following form:

"Whereas the security and inviolability of the HOME is an essential condition of political freedom and social well-being, it is hereby enacted that no tenant shall hereafter be evicted from his house or homestead, or have his household goods seized, for any other cause than non-payment of rent, and every heir or successor of such tenant shall be equally secure so long as the rent is paid."

A second clause would provide for a permanently fair rent.

Now, will not some advanced Liberal bring in such a bill annually till it is carried? It is, I think, one that would receive the support of a large number of reformers, because it is absolutely essential to the free and fair operation of the Parish and District Councils, and is equally necessary for the well-being of the farmer and the tradesman, as well as for the mechanic and laborer. The annual discussion of the subject in Parliament would be of inestimable value, since it would afford the opportunity of bringing prominently before the voters the numerous cases of gross tyranny and cruel injustice which are yearly occurring, but which now receive little consideration.

THE UNBORN NOT TO INHERIT PROPERTY

The next great guiding principle, and one that will enable us to carry out the resumption of the land without real injury to any individual, is that we should recognize no rights to property in the unborn, or even in persons under legal age, except

so far as to provide for their education and give them a suitable but moderate provision against want. This may be justified on two grounds. First, the law allows to individuals the right to will away their property as they please, so that not even the eldest son has any vested interest, as against the power of the actual owner of the property to leave it to whom or for what purpose he likes. Now, what an individual is permitted to do for individual reasons which may be good or bad, the State may do if it considers it necessary for the good of the community. If an individual may justly disinherit other individuals who have not already a vested interest in property, however just may be their expectations of succeeding to it, *a fortiori* the State may, partially, disinherit them for good and important reasons. In the second place, it is almost universally admitted by moralists and advanced thinkers that to be the heir to a great estate from birth is generally injurious to the individual, and is necessarily unjust to the community. It enables the individual to live a life of idleness and pleasure, which often becomes one of luxury and vice; while the community suffers from the bad example, and by the vicious standard of happiness which is set up by the spectacle of so much idleness and luxury. The working part of the community, on the other hand, suffers directly in having to provide the whole of the wealth thus injuriously wasted. Many people think that if such a rich man *pays* for everything he purchases and wastes, the workers do do not suffer because they receive an equivalent for their labor; but such persons overlook the fact that every pound spent by the idle is first provided *by* the workers. If the income thus spent is derived from land, it is *they* who really pay the rents to the landlord, inasmuch as if the landlord did not receive them they would go in reduction of taxation. If it comes from the funds or from railway shares, *they* equally provide it, in the taxes, in high railway fares, and increased price of goods due to exorbitant railway charges. Even if *all* taxes were raised by an income tax paid by rich men only, the workers would be the real payers, because there is no other possible source of annual income in the country but productive labor. If any one doubts this, let him consider what would happen were the

people to resume the land as their right, and thenceforth apply the rents, locally, to establish the various factories and other machinery needful to supply all the wants of the community. Gradually all workers would be employed on the land, or in the various co-operative or municipal industries, and would themselves receive the full product of their labors. To facilitate their exchanges they might establish a token or paper currency, and they would then have little use for gold or silver. How, then, could idlers live, if these workers, in the Parliament of the country, simply declined to pay the interest on debts contracted before they were born? What good would be their much vaunted "capital," consisting as it mostly does of mere legal power to take from the workers a portion of the product of their labors, which power would then have ceased; while their real capital—buildings, machinery, etc.—would bring them not one penny, since the workers would all possess their own, purchased by their own labor and the rents of their own land? Let but the workers resume possession of the soil, which was first obtained by private holders by force or fraud, or by the gift of successive kings who had no right to give it, and capitalists as a distinct class from workers must soon cease to exist.

NO RIGHT TO TAX FUTURE GENERATIONS

Another principle of equal importance is to refuse to recognize the right of any bygone rulers to tax future generations. Thus, all grants of land by kings or nobles, all "perpetual" pensions, and all war debts of the past, should be declared to be legally and equitably invalid, and henceforth dealt with in such a way as to relieve the workers of the burden of their payment as speedily as is consistent with due consideration for those whose chief support is derived from such sources. Just as we are now coming to recognize that a "living wage" is due to all workers, so we should recognize a "maximum income" determined by the standard of comfort of the various classes of fund holders and State or family pensioners. As a rule, these persons might be left to enjoy whatever they now possess during their lives, and when they had relatives dependent on

them the income might be continued to these, either for their lives or for a limited period, according to the circumstances of each case. There would be no necessity, and I trust no inclination, to cause the slightest real privation, or even inconvenience, to those who are but the product of a vicious system; but on every principle of justice and equity it is impossible to recognize the rights of deceased kings—most of them the worst and most contemptible of men—to burden the workers for all time in order to keep large bodies of their fellow-citizens in idleness and luxury.

HOW TO DEAL WITH ACCUMULATED WEALTH

By means of the principles now laid down, we can see how to deal fairly with the present possessors of great estates, and with millionaires, whose vast wealth confers no real benefit on themselves, while it necessarily robs the workers, since, as we have seen, it has all to be provided by the workers. It will, I think, be admitted that, if a man has an income, say, of ten thousand a year, that is sufficient to supply him with every possible necessary, comfort, and rational luxury, and that the possession of one or more additional ten thousands of income would not really add to his enjoyment. But all such excessive incomes necessarily produce evil results, in the large number of idle dependants they support, and in keeping up habits of gambling and excessive luxury. Further, in the case of landed estates, the management of which is necessarily left to agents and bailiffs, it leads to injurious interference with agriculture and with the political and religious freedom of tenants, to oppression of laborers, to the depopulation of villages, and other well-known evils. It will therefore be for the public benefit to fix on a maximum income to be owned by any citizen; and, thereupon, to arrange a progressive income tax, beginning with a very small tax on a minimum income from land or realized property of, say, £500, the tax progressively rising, at first slowly, afterward more rapidly, so as to absorb all above the fixed maximum.

When a landed estate was taken over for the use of the community, the net income which had been derived from

it would be paid the late holder for his life, and might be continued for the lives of such of his direct heirs as were of age at the time of passing the Act, or it might even be extended to all direct heirs living at that time. In the case of a person owning many landed estates in different counties, he might be given the option of retaining any one or more of them up to the maximum income, and that income would be secured to him (and his direct heirs as above stated) in case any of the land were taken for public use. In the case of fund-holders, all above the maximum income would be extinguished, and thus reduce taxation.

The process here sketched out—by which the continuous robbery of the people through the systems of land and fund holding may be at first greatly reduced and in the course of one or two generations completely stopped, without, as I maintain, real injury to any living person and for the great benefit both of existing workers and of the whole nation in the future—will, of course, be denounced as confiscation and robbery. That is the point of view of those who now benefit by the acts of former robbers and confiscators. From another, and I maintain a truer point of view, it may be described as an act of just and merciful restitution. Let us, therefore, consider the case a little more closely.

ORIGIN OF GREAT ESTATES.

Taking the inherited estates of the great landed proprietors of England, almost all can be traced back to some act of confiscation of former owners or to gifts from kings, often as the reward for what we now consider to be disgraceful services or great crimes. The whole of the property of the abbeys and monasteries, stolen by Henry VIII. and mostly given to the worst characters among the nobles of his court, was really a robbery of the people, who obtained relief and protection from the former owners. The successive steps by which the landlords got rid of the duties attached to landholding under the feudal system, and threw the main burden of defence and of the cost of government on non-landholders, was another direct robbery of the people. Then in later times, and down to

the present century, we have that barefaced robbery by form of law, the enclosure of the commons, leading, perhaps more than anything else, to the misery and destruction of the rural population. Much of this enclosure was made by means of false pretences. The general Enclosure Acts declare that the purpose of enclosure is to facilitate "the productive employment of labor" in the improvement of the land. Yet hundreds of thousands of acres in all parts of the country, especially in Surrey, Hampshire, Dorsetshire, and other southern counties, were simply taken from the people and divided among the surrounding landlords, and then only used for sport, not a single pound being spent in cultivating it. Now, however, during the last twenty years, much of this land is being sold for building at high building prices, a purpose never contemplated when the Enclosure Acts were obtained. During the last two centuries more than seven millions of acres have been thus taken from the poor by men who were already rich, and the more land they already possessed the larger share of the commons was allotted to them. Even a Royal Commission, in 1869, declared that these enclosures were often made "without any compensation to the smaller commoners, deprived agricultural laborers of ancient rights over the waste, and disabled the occupants of new cottages from acquiring new rights."

Now, in this long series of acts of plunder of the people's land, we have every circumstance tending to aggravate the crime. It was robbery of the poor by the rich. It was robbery of the weak and helpless by the strong. And it had that worst feature which distinguishes robbery from mere confiscation—the plunder was divided among the individual robbers. Yet, again, it was a form of robbery specially forbidden by the religion of the robbers, a religion for which they professed the deepest reverence, and of which they considered themselves the special defenders. They read in what they call *the Word of God*, "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there is no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth," yet this is what they are constantly striving for, not by purchase only, but by robbery. Again they are told, "The land shall not be sold for ever, for the land is

Mine"; and at every fiftieth year all land was to return to the family that had sold it, so that no one could keep land beyond the year of jubilee; and the reason was that no man or family should remain permanently impoverished.

Both in law and in morality the receiver of stolen goods is as bad as the thief; and even if he has purchased a stolen article unknowingly an honorable man will, when he discovers the fact, restore it to the rightful owner. Now, our great hereditary landlords know very well that they are the legal possessors of much stolen property, and, moreover, property which their religion forbids them to hold in great quantities. Yet we have never heard of a single landlord making restitution to the robbed nation. On the contrary, they take every opportunity of adding to their vast possessions, not only by purchase, but by that meanest form of robbery—the enclosing of every scrap of roadside grass they can lay their hands on, so that the wayfarer or the tourist may have nothing but dust or gravel to walk upon, and the last bit of food for the cottager's donkey or goose is taken away from him.

This all-embracing system of land robbery, for which nothing is too great and nothing too little; which has absorbed meadow and forest, moor and mountain; which has secured most of our rivers and lakes, and the fish which inhabit them; which often claims the very seashore and rocky coast line of our island home, making the peasant pay for his seaweed manure and the fisherman for his bait of shellfish; which has desolated whole counties to replace men by sheep or cattle, and has destroyed fields and cottages to make a wilderness for deer; which has stolen the commons and filched the roadside wastes; which has driven the laboring poor into the cities, and has thus been the primary and chief cause of the lifelong misery, disease, and early death of thousands who might have lived lives of honest toil and comparative comfort had they been permitted free access to land in their native villages;—it is the advocates and beneficiaries of this inhuman system, the members of this "cruel organization," who, when a partial restitution of their unholy gains is proposed, are the loudest in their cries of "robbery!" But all the robbery, all the spolia-

tion, all the legal and illegal filching has been on *their* side, and they still hold the stolen property. *They* make laws to justify their actions, and *we* propose equally to make laws which will really justify ours, because, unlike their laws which always took from the poor to give to the rich, ours will take only from the superfluity of the rich, not to give to the poor individually, but to enable the poor to live by honest work, to restore to the whole people their birthright in their native soil, and to relieve all alike from a heavy burden of unnecessary taxation. This will be the true statesmanship of the future, and will be justified alike by equity, by ethics, and by religion.

And now, in conclusion, I will give one or two extracts from a book written by a self-taught worker for workers, to show how workers feel on the questions we have touched upon.

"At present the working people of this country live under conditions altogether monstrous. Their labor is much too heavy, their pleasures are too few; and in their close streets and crowded houses decency and health and cleanliness are wellnigh impossible. It is not only the wrong of this that I resent, it is the *waste*. Look through the slums, and see what childhood, girlhood, womanhood, and manhood have there become. Think what a waste of beauty, of virtue, of strength, and of all the power and goodness that go to make a nation great, is being consummated there by ignorance and by injustice. For, depend upon it, every one of our brothers or sisters ruined or slain by poverty or vice is a loss to the nation of so much bone and sinew, of so much courage and skill, of so much glory and delight. Cast your eyes, then, over the Registrar-General's returns, and imagine, if you can, how many gentle nurses, good mothers, sweet singers, brave soldiers, clever artists, inventors and thinkers, are swallowed up every year in that ocean of crime and sorrow which is known to the official mind as 'the high death rate of the wage-earning classes.' Alas! the pity of it."

And again, from the same writer:

"A short time ago a certain writer, much esteemed for his graceful style of saying silly things, informed us that the poor

remained poor because they show no efficient desire to be anything else. Is that true? Are only the idle poor? Come with me, and I will show you where men and women work from morning till night, from week to week, from year to year, at the full stretch of their powers, in dim and fetid dens, and yet are poor, ay, destitute—have for their wages a crust of bread and rags. I will show you where men work in dirt and heat, using the strength of brutes, for a dozen hours a day, and sleep at night in styes, until brain and muscle are exhausted; and fresh slaves are yoked to the golden car of commerce, and the broken drudges filter through the union or the prison, to a felon's or a pauper's grave! And I will show you how men and women thus work and suffer, and faint and die, generation after generation, and I will show you how the longer and harder these wretches toil the worse their lot becomes; and I will show you the graves and find witnesses to the histories of brave and noble industrious poor men, whose lives were lives of toil *and* poverty, and whose deaths were tragedies. And all these things are due to *sin;* but it is to the sin of the smug hypocrites who grow rich upon the robbery and the ruin of their fellow-creatures."

These extracts are from a small but weighty book called "Merrie England," by Nunquam. In the form of a series of letters on socialism to a workingman, it contains more important facts, more acute reasoning, more conclusive argument, and more good writing, than are to be found in any English work on the subject I am acquainted with. When such men—and there are many of them—are returned to Parliament, and are able to influence the government of the country, the dawn of a new era, bright with hope for the long-suffering workers, will be at hand.

XXX

ANARCHISM

"THOU SHALT NOT KILL"

BY

COUNT LEO TOLSTOI

AND

GEORGE J. HOLYOAKE

SOCIALISM with all its various shades of speculation has powerful advocates among our leaders of intellect, but anarchism has no friends except among the rebels of extremely rabid type. Even Tolstoi, of all our philosophers perhaps the most "advanced," the keenest of insight and least fettered of convention, even he cries out against anarchism, not for its savagery, which he denies, but for its mistaken folly. Anarchism is a disease; and its cause, as in all diseases, must lie in some unhealthy condition of the body politic. Perhaps we need only to suppress the outbreak of the evil; perhaps a wiser effort might be made to cure it by discovering and eradicating its cause. Hence we supplement here the views of the Russian, Tolstoi, with those of Mr. Holyoake, a well-known Member of Parliament in England. Between them they point out for us very fully the sources, the dangers, and the probable results of this wholly unsatisfactory product of our civilization.

"Thou shalt do no murder."—Ex. xx. 13.

"The disciple is not above his master: but every one when he is perfected shall be as his master."—LUKE vi. 40.

"For all they that take up the sword shall perish with the sword."—MATT. xxvi. 52.

"All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them."—MATT. vii. 12.

WHEN kings are tried and executed like Charles I., Louis XVI., and Maximilian of Mexico; or killed in a palace con-

spiracy like Peter III., Paul, and all kinds of Sultans, Shahs, and Khans, the event is generally passed over in silence. But when one of them is killed without a trial, and not by a palace conspiracy; like Henry IV., Alexander II., Carnot, the Empress of Austria, the Shah of Persia, and, recently, King Humbert of Italy, then such murder causes great surprise and indignation among Kings and Emperors, and those attached to them, as if they were the great enemies of murder, as if they never profited by murder, never took part in it, and never gave orders to commit it. And yet the kindest of these murdered Kings, such as Alexander II., or Humbert, were guilty of the murder of tens of thousands of persons killed on the battlefield, not to mention those executed at home; while hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of people have been killed, hanged, beaten to death, or shot, by the more cruel Kings and Emperors.

Christ's teaching cancels the law "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"; but those men who have kept to the older law and still keep to it, who act upon it by punishing and carrying on wars, and who not only act on the law "an eye for an eye," but give orders to kill thousands without any provocation, by declaring war—*they* have no right to be indignant when the same law is applied to themselves in so infinitesimal a measure that hardly one King or Emperor gets killed to a hundred thousand, or perhaps to a million, ordinary people killed by the order or with the consent of Kings and Emperors.

Kings and Emperors should not be indignant when such murders as that of Alexander II. or Humbert occur, but should, on the contrary, be surprised that such murders are so rare, considering the continual and universal example of committing murders they themselves set the people.

Kings and Emperors are surprised and horrified when one of themselves is murdered, and yet the whole of their activity consists in managing murder and preparing for murder. The keeping up, the teaching and exercising, of armies with which Kings and Emperors are always so much occupied, and of which they are the organizers—what is it but preparation for murder?

The masses are so hypnotized that, though they see what is continually going on around them, they do not understand what it means. They see the unceasing care Kings, Emperors, and Presidents bestow on disciplined armies, see the parades, reviews, and manœuvres they hold, and of which they boast to one another, and the people eagerly crowd to see how their own brothers, dressed up in bright-colored, glittering clothes, are turned into machines to the sound of drums and trumpets, and, obedient to the shouting of one man, all make the same movements; and they do not understand the meaning of it all.

Yet the meaning of such drilling is very clear and simple. It is preparing for murder. It means the stupefying of men in order to convert them into instruments for murdering.

And it is just Kings and Emperors and Presidents who do it, and organize it, and pride themselves on it. And it is these same people whose special employment is murder organizing, who have made murder their profession, who dress in military uniforms, and carry weapons (swords at their side), who are horror-struck and indignant when one of themselves is killed.

It is not because such murders as the recent murder of Humbert are exceptionally cruel that they are so terrible. Things done by the order of Kings and Emperors, not only in the days of old, such as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, persecutions for faith, terrible ways of putting down peasant riots, but also the present executions, the torture of solitary cells and disciplinary battalions, hanging, decapitation, shooting, and slaughter at the wars, are incomparably more cruel than the murders committed by anarchists.

Nor is it on account of their injustice that these murders are terrible. If Alexander and Humbert did not deserve death, the thousands of Russians who perished at Plevna, and of Italians who perished in Abyssinia, deserved it still less. No, it is not because of their cruelty and injustice these murders are terrible, but because of the want of reason in those who perpetrate them.

If the regicides commit murder under the influence of feelings of indignation, evoked by witnessing the sufferings of

the enslaved people, for which sufferings they hold Alexander II., Carnot, or Humbert responsible, or because they are influenced by personal desire for revenge—however immoral such conduct may be, still it is comprehensible; but how can an organized body of anarchists such as those by whom, it is said, Bréssi was sent out, and by whom another Emperor was threatened, how can it, quietly considering means of improving the condition of the people, find nothing better to do than to murder people, the killing of whom is as useful as cutting off one of the Hydra's heads?

Kings and Emperors have long established a system resembling the mechanism of a magazine rifle, *i.e.*, as soon as one bullet flies out another takes its place. "*Le roi est mort—vive le roi!*" Then what is the use of killing them? It is only from a most superficial point of view that the murder of such persons can seem a means of saving the people from oppression and wars, which destroy their lives.

We need only remember that the same kind of oppression and war went on no matter who stood at the head of the Government: Nicholas or Alexander, Louis or Napoleon, Frederic or William, Palmerston or Gladstone, McKinley or any one else, in order to see that it is not some definite person who causes the oppression and the wars from which people suffer.

The misery of the people is not caused by individuals, but by an order of Society by which they are bound together in a way that puts them in the power of a few, or, more often, of one man: a man so depraved by his unnatural position—having the fate and lives of millions of people in his power—that he is always in an unhealthy state and suffering more or less from a mania of self-aggrandizement, which is not noticed in him only because of his exceptional position.

Apart from the fact that such men are surrounded, from the cradle to the grave, by the most insane luxury and its usual accompaniment of flattery and servility, the whole of their education, and all their occupations, are centred on the one object of murder, the study of murder in the past, the best means of murdering in the present, the best ways of preparing for murder in the future. From their earliest years they learn

the art of murder in all possible forms, always carry about with them instruments of murder, dress in different uniforms, attend parades, manœuvres, and reviews, visit each other, present orders and the command of regiments to each other. And yet not only does nobody tell them the real name of their actions, not only does nobody tell them that preparing for murder is revolting and criminal, but they hear nothing but praise and words of admiration from all around them for these actions.

The only part of the Press that reaches them, and which seems to them to be the expression of the feelings of the best of the people or their best representatives, exalts all their words and deeds, however silly and wicked they may be, in the most servile manner. All who surround them, men and women, cleric or lay, all these people who do not value human dignity, vie with each other in flattering them in the most refined manner, agree with them in everything, and deceive them continually, making it impossible for them to know life as it is. These men might live to be a hundred and never see a real, free man, and never hear the truth.

We are sometimes appalled by the words and deeds of these men, but if we only consider their state we cannot but see that any man would act in the same way in such a position. A reasonable man can do but one thing in such a position, *i.e.*, leave it. Every one who remains in such a position will act in the same manner.

What, indeed, must be going on in the head of some William of Germany, a man of limited understanding, little education, and with a great deal of ambition, whose ideals are like those of a German "junker," when any silly or horrid thing he may say is always met with an enthusiastic "*Hoch!*" and commented on, as if it were something very important, by the Press of the whole world? He says that the soldiers should be prepared to kill their own fathers in obedience to his command. The answer is "Hurrah!" He says the Gospels must be introduced with a fist of iron. "Hurrah!" He says that the Army must not take any prisoners in China, but kill all, and he is not placed in a lunatic asylum, but they cry "Hurrah!" and set sail for China to execute his orders.

Or Nicholas, who, though naturally modest, begins his reign by declaring to venerable old men, in answer to the desire they express of being allowed to discuss their own affairs, that their hope for self-government is a senseless dream. And the organs of the Press that reach him, and the people whom he meets, praise him for it. He proposes a childish, silly, and untruthful project of universal peace at the same time that he is ordering an increase of the Army, and even then there are no limits to the laudations of his wisdom and his virtue. Without any reason, he senselessly and pitilessly offends the whole of the Finnish nation, and again hears nothing but praise. At last he enters upon the Chinese slaughter, terrible by its injustice, cruelty, and its contrast with his project of peace; and he gets applauded simultaneously from all sides, both for his own conquests and for his adherence to his father's policy of peace. What must indeed be going on in the heads and hearts of such men?

So that it is not Alexanders and Humberts, Williams, Nicholases, and Chamberlains, who are the cause of oppression and war, even though they do organize them, but it is those who have placed them in, and support them in, a position in which they have power over the life and death of men.

Therefore it is not necessary to kill Alexanders and Nicholases, Williams and Humberts, but only to leave off supporting the social condition of which they are the product. It is the selfishness and stupefaction of the people who sell their freedom and their honor for insignificant material advantages which supports the present state of society.

Those who stand on the lowest rung of the ladder, partly as a consequence of being stupefied by a patriotic and pseudo-religious education, partly for the sake of personal advantages, give up their freedom and their feeling of human dignity to those who stand higher, and who offer them material advantages. In a like position are those standing a little higher. They, too, through being stupefied, and especially for material advantages, give up their freedom and sense of human dignity. The same is true of those standing still higher; and so it continues up to the highest rungs, up to the person or persons who,

standing on the very summit of the social cone, have no one to submit to, nor anywhere to rise to, and have no motive for action except ambition and love of power. These are generally so depraved and stupefied by their insane power over life and death, and by the flattery and servility of those around them, which is connected with such power, that while doing evil they feel convinced they are the benefactors of the human race. It is the people themselves who, by sacrificing their human dignity for material profits, produce these men, and are afterwards angry with them for their stupid and cruel acts; murdering such people is like whipping children after spoiling them.

Very little seems needed to stop oppression and useless war, and to prevent any one from being indignant with those who seem to be the cause of such oppression and war.

Only that things should be called by their right names and seen as they are; that it should be understood that an army is an instrument of murder, that the recruiting and drilling of armies which Kings, Emperors, and Presidents carry on with so much self-assurance are preparations for murder.

If only every King, Emperor, and President would understand that his work of organizing armies is not an honorable and important duty, as his flatterers persuade him it is, but a most abominable business, *i.e.*, the preparing for, and the managing of, murder. If only every private individual understood that the payment of taxes which helps to equip soldiers, and, above all, military service, are not immaterial but highly immoral actions, by which he not only permits murder, but takes part in it himself—then this power of the Kings and Emperors which arouses indignation, and causes them to be killed, would come to an end of itself.

And so the Alexanders, Carnots, Humberts, and others should not be killed, but it ought to be shown them that they are murderers; and, above all, they should not be allowed to kill men; their orders to murder should not be obeyed.

If men do not yet act in this manner, it is only because Governments, to maintain themselves, diligently exercise a hypnotic influence upon the people. Therefore we can help to

prevent people killing Kings and each other, not by murder—murders only strengthen this hypnotic state—but by arousing men from the delusion in which they are held.

And it is this that I have tried to do in these remarks.

BY

GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE

ANARCHISM arises from the despair of the good and the malevolence of the bad. There are two kinds of anarchists, just as there are two kinds of Tories. The social kind seek power, that they may control public affairs for the good of the people, which they believe they can better manage than the people themselves. The political Tories seek paramountcy and authority for pride or interest, and are indifferent or hostile to the welfare of the people—not counting them of consequence. In like manner there are anarchists who seek by reason to supersede public government by self-government—a slow, long-lasting task. There is another and brutal class of anarchists who are animated by resentment and the baser sort by vengeance. They seek to destroy the most conspicuous representatives of order or government. They have that purpose, but no plan. Their future is only a day or a week. Their motive, so far as they can be said to have one, is to bring about a change. They think any change must be for the better—which shows their credulity. They are under the impression that were authority destroyed things would right themselves—which they never do. The prospect that they will is so hopeless that persons on this sane side of madness can never accept this wild and blind solution of societarian wrongs, whatever they may be. Whoever puts this dismal doctrine into practice must be arrested, and the repetition of the offence made impossible or improbable. Society must vindicate itself against irresponsible subjection. Yet it may temper the expression of public wrath

to remember that the awful belief that murder is a mode of progress is not peculiar to anarchists. Charles the Second gave a colonelcy to Silas Titus, who wrote inciting the assassination of the Lord Protector Cromwell. English Tories favored the assassination of Napoleon, and he in his turn pensioned the man who sought the assassination of Wellington. All the monarchs of Europe praised the knife of Charlotte Corday. Froude has shown that Catholics and Protestants have alike approved tyrannicide and used it. Did not Lord Beaconsfield "bless the hand that wields the regicidal steel"? We all know how the French Revolutionists ruined their cause and perished by the hands of their own adherents, and led to a worse despotism than that which they subverted, and established it or strengthened it all over Europe. If the anarchists of the dagger or the bullet had their way, they would all be destroyed by their own disciples of more "advanced views," who would find their existence an obstacle to further progress. Therefore let the doctrine that murder is a mode of progress be execrated wherever it shows itself in high place or low, in the yellow press or in the streets. Carlyle, by his dangerous gospel of force, has done more than all the anarchists to demoralize our national policy and to inspire political assassination with a sense of rectitude, as I learned from Madame Pulsky. It caused Canon Kingsley, just-minded as he was, and Lord Tennyson, who had as many virtues as gifts, to support, to applaud Governor Eyre's murders in Jamaica. I sat by Governor Eyre in the House of Commons when Mr. Cardwell (afterwards Lord Cardwell) admitted that there had been unnecessary "executions," which is the parliamentary name for murder. I hate anarchy alike in military or civil life, and all that leads to it or incites revenge by death, as does the new doctrine—that "leniency is a mistake"—that it is weakness or cowardice. Can there be any wonder that some people, for the ends of their hatred, better these perilous instructions? And so incited, the pitiless sentiment acts equally in republics and monarchies.

Anarchism is not a modern invention—is not a foreign device—it is a disease of impatience in politics, and many have it. But it is without excuse in countries where reasonable freedom

exists. If with a free press, free speech, and a free Parliament, agitators cannot advance just objects, they do not understand their business.

Nameless incidents to outrage everybody is willing to see forbidden. Those who are invited to act upon the advice of the writer have a right to know upon whose authority they are to place themselves in jeopardy. When a publisher, I exacted this condition in respect of any pamphlet of perilous tendency brought to me. Authors of deadly counsel against the state could not, or should not, object, when called upon, to explain their intent. It was Bakunin who first in modern days proposed to end government by the knife. He was listened to because he was a Russian and belonged to a land where reason was not tolerated and irresponsible ferocity ruled. Wiser and nobler men than Bakunin, men of unrivalled learning, such as Elisée Reclus, his brother Elie, and others, are philosophical anarchists.

Elie Reclus came to me to solicit a scarce engraving of Robert Owen, a famous advocate of progress by reason. The philosophical anarchists adopt, or accept, the name, but have no anarchy in them. They are against conventional government—not from malice, but because they think self-government nobler. What they seek is unlimited freedom, which, if set going to-morrow, would not last a month. They hold that free association will be the ultimate form of society. There is no disquietude in that—but the distance to it is distressing. They are for voluntary, not compulsory society. Their passion is for absolute individual freedom. It may be described as individuality run mad—as men and things go. Yet it is not a bad theory that a man should be a law unto himself. Others have thought that who are not counted as anarchists. But he who is to be a law unto himself should have a perfect self. And society has reared very few of that kind. True, Shakespeare says, "To thine own self be true." But if a man who was a rascal by nature, or policy, or interest, were true to himself, he would be a very undesirable person to know. However, this theory of anarchy has no bullet in it and its discussion no harm in it.

Society would be silly not to distinguish between the anarchy

of reason and the anarchy of violence. To the anarchy of assassination there can be but one answer: whether the motive be good or ill, benevolent or hostile, its hand must be arrested and its further use be provided against. But in a manner firm and self-regarding. Because some anarchist goes mad that is no reason why society should. One man's insanity is not cured by another becoming insane. The Indian Thug was far more dangerous than any enemies of order abroad now. The cord has gone in India, and the knife will follow in Europe. Public perturbation only inflates the assassin with self-importance, and incites the emulation of the obscure. Furious epithets increase partisans by affording a species of spurious reason for serious retaliation. When Dynamitards arose, their operations were confined to futile alarms producing injury to unimportant persons only, when a young lord in the House of Commons accused them of want of courage to attack persons in high places. Everybody knows the response to that incautious jeer. We have seen a European emperor describe, in a telegram, the assailant of President McKinley as a "dastardly person." A dastard is a coward who is afraid of danger. Unhappily these assailants are not all cowards and these epithets incite them to show that they are not. They may be fiends—they may be execrable—but he who takes his life in his hands is not a dastard. This assailant was atrocious. He shot the President who extended the hand of courtesy and amity to him. A man who throws bombs, which bring death to the innocent also, from which he seeks to escape, is a dastard.

Nevertheless, let the ministers of repression have discriminating eyes. I have known men of real tenderness, of generosity and humanity, who had, notwithstanding, a sanguinary strain in their principles. Many in high places have it, as all who watch them, or read their utterances by speech or pen, well know. If they bring their sentiment into operation, they should be made to answer for it as well as the vulgar brute whose mind is murderous. There is a foolish praise of "thoroughness" (the fruitful source of many outrages) by persons who do not know that all principles have their limits. Thoroughness means the extermination of all obstacles in the way of a theory. Even

thoroughness in good has its perils. It is a maxim of experience that it takes half the time of the wise to correct and protect themselves from the errors of the good.

Some years ago, when our Government were asked to enter into a European concert to repress anarchism, Mr. Gladstone asked me what I thought of such a step, saying his disinclination to it was that the modes of procedure in some countries were such as would revolt the English people, and England, if it entered into the concert, would be committed to the approval and be understood to sanction whatever occurred. It was impossible not to agree in this view. Every country has means of dealing with the evil in question if it has prudence and patience. Every anarchist is known to the police and in every group there is a spy or a fool. What more can the police want? The extinction of this evil lies in higher hands and other manners than theirs.

The objection to government and lawful order is simply a reversion to the savage state. Mr. Auberon Herbert and the philosophers of absolute freedom cannot make anything else of it. The savage life is bold, brave, defiant, and full of original activities—but very inconvenient to others. Its ceaseless watchfulness, vicissitudes, and tragedies contain no time for progress. The irreconcilable philosopher who is out of it thinks he would be better in it. Let him try it. The opportunity is open to him. There are savages of the purest type who will be glad to receive him—and eat him when meals run short. We always have persons among us devoid of appreciation of the advantages into which they were born—not knowing what their forefathers suffered for want of them, or what it cost to obtain them. The philosophers who are against government do not realize what life is without it. Men may be too much governed—they often are; but the remedy does not lie in the extreme of no government. Anarchic outrage is born of this impetuous oversight. The best of life does not consist of defiance. There is dignity in just obedience. There is noble pleasure in grateful or useful service. It is this sense which philosophical and proletarian anarchy alike lack.

XXXI

WAR

"A DEMONSTRATION OF ITS FUTILITY"

BY

DAVID STARR JORDAN

PRESIDENT OF LELAND STANFORD UNIVERSITY

AND

CARL SCHURZ

FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR

IN our last address the celebrated Tolstoi insisted that war was murder. This, alas, comes so near to being terribly true that there have been few wars indeed where it can be urged that both sides fought under pressure of necessity. In private life most of us, even if causelessly attacked, would go to great lengths of yielding and avoidance rather than assume the tremendous and tragic responsibility of destroying the life of the assailant. Yet the same one of us who thus recognizes the sanctity of human existence in the individual will cry out for war, for death in uncounted thousands, as heedlessly as if it were some childish game to be played for tops or kisses. We clamor that we will show the foe they "can't bluff us," that we will "give them a good hiding, sir, and teach them who we are!" Silly vanity and idle bluster! Are these the inspiring thoughts which sanctify a thousand murders and make each glorious? Is this the spirit in which to raise the curtain upon a national tragedy?

Yet there are not wanting those among us who seriously believe in war. It teaches courage, they say; and moreover, good as our own nation may be, other nations are so wicked we are forced to keep prepared and on guard. It is with these thoughts in view that many of us, unconsciously perhaps, have come to look on war as a vague, far-off necessity, not likely to affect us personally. Hence we neglect to meditate upon

its moral turpitude. War is only "hell" to those who have lived and thought amid its horrors. And while many of us may turn from it with vague distaste, there has been lacking in most minds the active motive for antagonism against it, which is here supplied by two of our most eminent citizens.

David Starr Jordan, LL.D., the honored president of a great university, has long been one of the most powerful and impassioned of our pleaders against all war. This present address he delivered last spring at the Franklin centennial celebration in Philadelphia, and it is here printed with his approval. The name of Carl Schurz is too well known to need explanation. As editor of Harper's Weekly he wrote the accompanying celebrated appeal in the days of popular excitement which preceded our Spanish war. This brilliant address has been often quoted in part. It is here reprinted in full by permission of Messrs. Harper and Brothers. Both articles deal with the subject calmly and practically, examining it by a method scientific rather than emotional.

THE HUMAN HARVEST

BY

David Starr Jordan

SCIENCE is wisdom set in order. It is known as science by its orderly arrangement, but above and beyond all matters of arrangement the wisdom itself must take rank. Wisdom is the essence of human experience, the contact of mind with the order of nature. Of all men of his time, Benjamin Franklin was preëminently a man of wisdom. By the same token the first leader in science in America, he still takes rank with the greatest.

So in this time of heroic recognition, it is proper that a speaker of to-day should find his message in the words of Benjamin Franklin, and the message I choose is one for which this city of Philadelphia has always stood and from which it has taken its Greek name, the name which in classical phrase says with a single word that men are brothers worthy of our love. It

is a message for which the State of Pennsylvania has always stood, for the same principle was embodied in the life of William Penn. This has always been a Quaker City, and the Quakers, the Friends, have been our best apostles of the gospel of "peace on earth, good will towards men," the culmination of social and political wisdom.

Benjamin Franklin once said, "All war is bad; some wars worse than others." Then, once again, in more explicit terms, referring to the dark shadow of war cast over scenes of peace, the evil of the standing army, Franklin said to Baynes:

"If one power singly were to reduce its standing army it would be instantly overrun by other nations. Yet I think there is one effect of a standing army which must in time be felt so as to bring about the abolition of the system. A standing army not only diminishes the population of a country, but even the size and breed of the human species. For an army is the flower of the nation. All the most vigorous, stout, and well-made men in a kingdom are to be found in the army, and these men in general cannot marry."[1]

What is true of standing armies is far more true of armies that fight and fall; for, as Franklin said again, "Wars are not paid for in war times: the bill comes later."

In the discussion of the principles involved in Franklin's words, I must lay before you four fragments of history, three stories told because they are true, and one parable not true, but told for the lesson it teaches. And this is the first: Once there was a man, strong, wealthy, and patient, who dreamed of a finer type of horse than had ever yet existed. This horse should be handsome, clean limbed, intelligent, docile, strong, and swift. These traits were to be not those of one horse alone, a member of a favored equine aristocracy; they were to be "bred in the bone" so that they would continue from generation to generation, the attributes of a special common type of horse. And with this dream ever before his waking eyes, he invoked for his aid the four twin genii of organic life, the four by which all the magic of transformism of species has been accomplished either in nature or in art. And these forces once in his service, he

[1] Parton's "Life of Franklin," II, p. 572.

left to their control all the plans included in his great ambition. These four genii or fates are not strangers to us, nor were they new to the human race. Being so great and so strong, they are invisible to all save those who seek them. Men who deal with them after the fashion of science give them commonplace names: variation, heredity, segregation, selection.

Because not all horses are alike, because in fact no two were ever quite the same, the first appeal was made to the genius of Variation. Looking over the world of horses, he found to his hand Kentucky race-horses, clean limbed, handsome, and fleet, some more so and others less. So those which had the most of the virtues of the horse which was to be were chosen to be blended in new creation. Then again, he found thoroughbred horses of Arabian stock, hardy and strong and intelligent. These virtues were needed in the production of the perfect horse. And here came the need of the second genius, who is called Heredity. With the crossing of the racer with the thoroughbred, all qualities of both were blended in the progeny. The next generation partook of all desirable traits and again of undesirable ones as well. Some the one, and some the other, for sire and dam alike had given the stamp of its own kind and for the most part in equal degree. But again never in a degree quite equal, and in some measure these matters varied with each sire and each dam, and with each colt of all their progeny. It was found that the progeny of the mare called Beautiful Bells excelled all others in retaining all that was good in fine horses and in rejecting all that a noble horse should not have. And like virtues were attached to the sires called Palo Alto, Electricity, and Electioneer.

But there were horses and horses; horses not of the chosen breed, and should these enter the fold with their common blood, it would endanger all that had been already accomplished. For the ideal horse mating with the common horse controls at the best but half the traits of the progeny. If the strain were to be established, the vulgar horseflesh must be kept away, and only the best remain in association with the best. Thus Segregation, the third of the genii, was called into service lest the successes of this herd be lost in the failure of some other.

Under the spell of Heredity all the horses partook of the charm of Beautiful Bells and of Electricity and of Palo Alto, for firmly and persistently all others were banished from their presence. There were some who were not strong, some who were not sleek, some who were not fleet, some who were not clean-limbed, nor docile, nor intelligent. At least, they were not so to the degree which the dream of fair horses demanded. By the force of Selection, all such were sent away. Variation was always at work making one colt unlike another; Heredity made each colt a blend or mosaic of traits of sire and of grandsires and granddams; Selection left only good traits to form this mosaic, and the grandsire and granddam, sire and dam, and the rest of the ancestry lived their lives again in the expanding circle of descent.

Thus in the final result, the horses who were left were the horses of their owner's dream. The future of the breed was fixed, and fixed at the beginning by the very framing of the conditions under which it lived. It is variation which gives better as well as worse. It is heredity which saves all that has been attained—for better or for worse. It is selection by which better triumphs over worse, and it is segregation which protects the final result from falling again into the grasp of the general average. In all this, selection is the vital, moving, changing force. It throws the shaping of the future on the individual chosen by the present. The horse who is left marks the future of his kind. The history of the steed is an elongation of the history of those who are chosen for parentage. And with the best of the best chosen for parentage, the best of the best appears in the progeny. The horse-harvest is good in each generation. As the seed we sow, so shall we reap.

And this story is true, known to thousands of men. And it will be true again just as often as men may try to carry it into experiment. And it will be true not of horses alone, for the four fates which guide and guard life have no partiality for horses but work just as persistently for cattle or sheep, or plums or roses, or calla or cactus, as they do for horses or for men. From the very beginning of life they have wrought untiringly—and in your life and in mine—in the grass of the field, the trees

of the forest—in bird and beast, everywhere we find the traces of their energy.

And this brings me to my second story, which is not true as history, but only in its way as parable.

There was once a man—strenuous no doubt, but not wise, for he did not give heed to the real nature of things and so he set himself to do by his own unaided hand the work which only the genii can accomplish. And this man possessed also a stud of horses. They were docile, clean-limbed, fleet, and strong, and he would make them still more strong and swift. So he rode them swiftly with all his might—day and night, always on the course, always pushed to the utmost, leaving only the dull and sluggish to remain in the stalls. For it was his dream to fill these horses with the spirit of action, with the glory of swift motion, that this glory might be carried on and on to the last generation of horses. There were some who could not keep the pace, and to these and these alone he assigned the burden of bearing colts. And the feeble and the broken, the dull of wit, the coarse of limb, became each year the mothers of the colts. The horses who were chosen for the race-course he trained with every care, and every stroke of discipline showed itself in the flashing eyes and straining muscles—such were the best horses. But the other horses were the horses who were left. From their loins came the next generation and with these then was less fire and less speed than the first horses possessed in such large measure. But still the rush went on—whip and spur made good the lack of native movement. The racers still pushed on the course, while in the stall and paddocks at home the dull and common horses bore their dull and common colts. Variation was still at work with these as patiently as ever. Heredity followed, repeating faithfully whatever was left to her. Segregation, always conservative, guarded her own, but could not make good the deficiencies. Selection, forced to act perversely, chose for the future the worst and not the best, as was her usual fashion. So the current of life ran steadily downward. The herd was degenerating because it was each year an inferior herd which bred. Each generation yielded weaker colts, rougher, duller, clumsier colts, and no amount

of training or lash or whip or spur made any permanent difference for the better. The *horse harvest* was bad. Thoroughbred and race-horse gave place to common beasts, for in the removal of the noble the ignoble always finds its opportunity. It is always the horse that remains which determines the future of the stud.

In like fashion from the man who is left flows the current of human history.

This tale then is a parable, a story of what never was, but which is always trying to become true.

Once there was a great king—and the nation over which he bore rule lay on the flanks of a mountain range, spreading across fair hills and valleys green and fertile, across to the Mediterranean Sea. And the men of his race, fair and strong, self-reliant and self-confident, men of courage and men of action, were men "who knew no want they could not fill for themselves." They knew none on whom they looked down, and none to whom they regarded themselves inferior. And for all things which men could accomplish these ploughmen of the Tiber and the Apennines felt themselves fully competent and adequate. "Vir," they called themselves in their own tongue, and *virile*, virilis, men like them are called to this day. It was the weakling and the slave who was crowded to the wall; the man of courage begat descendants. In each generation and from generation to generation the human harvest was good. And the great wise king who ruled them—but here my story halts, for there was no king. There could be none. For it was written, men fit to be called men, men who are *Vires*, "are too self-willed, too independent, and too self-cultured to be ruled by anybody but themselves." Kings are for weaklings, not for men. Men free-born control their own destinies. "The fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves that we are underlings." For it was later said of these same days: "there was a Brutus once, who would have brooked the Eternal Devil to take his seat in Rome, as easily as a king" And so there was no king to cherish and control these men and his subjects. The spirit of freedom was the only ruler they knew, and this spirit being herself metaphoric called to her aid the four great genii

which create and recreate nations. Variation was ever at work, while heredity held fast all that she developed. Segregation in her mountain fastnesses held the world away, and selection chose the best and for the best purposes, casting aside the weakly, and the slave, holding the man for the man's work, and ever the man's work was at home, building the cities, subduing the forests, draining the marshes, adjusting the customs and statutes, preparing for the new generations. So the men begat sons of men after their own fashion, and the men of strength and courage were ever dominant. The Spirit of Freedom was a wise master, cares wisely for all that he controls.

So in the early days, when Romans were men, when Rome was small, without glory, without riches, without colonies and without slaves, these were the days of Roman greatness.

Then the Spirit of Freedom little by little gave way to the Spirit of Domination. Conscious of power, men sought to exercise it, not on themselves but on one another. Little by little, this meant banding together, aggression, suppression, plunder, struggle, glory, and all that goes with the pomp and circumstance of war. The individuality of men was lost in the aggrandizement of the few. Independence was swallowed up in ambition, patriotism came to have a new meaning. It was transferred from the hearth and home to the trail of the army.

It does not matter to us now what were the details of the subsequent history of Rome. We have now to consider only a single factor In science, this factor is known as "reversal of selection." "Send forth the best ye breed!" That was the word of the Roman war-call. And the Spirit of Domination took these words literally, and the best were sent forth. In the conquests of Rome, *Vir*, the real man, went forth to battle and to the work of foreign invasion; *Homo*, the human being, remained in the farm and the workshop and begat the new generations. Thus "Vir gave place to Homo." The sons of real men gave place to the sons of scullions, stable-boys, slaves, camp followers, and the riff-raff of those the great victorious army does not want.

The fall of Rome was not due to luxury, effeminacy, cor-

ruption, the wickedness of Nero and Caligula, the weakness of the train of Constantine's worthless descendants. It was fixed at Philippi, when the spirit of domination was victorious over the spirit of freedom. It was fixed still earlier, in the rise of consuls and triumvirates and the fall of the simple, sturdy, self-sufficient race who would brook no arbitrary ruler. When the real men fell in war, or were left in far-away colonies, the life of Rome still went on. But it was a different type of Roman which continued it, and this new type repeated in Roman history its weakling parentage.

"It is puerile," says Charles Ferguson, "to suppose that kingdoms are made by kings. The kings could do nothing if the mob did not throw up its cap when the king rides by. The king is consented to by the mob, because of that in him which is mob-like. The mob loves glory and prizes, so does the king. If he loved beauty and justice, the mob would shout for him while the fine words were sounding in the air, but he could never celebrate a jubilee or establish a dynasty. When the crowd gets ready to demand justice and beauty, it becomes a democracy and has done with kings."

Thus we read in Roman history the rise of the mob and of the emperor who is the mob's exponent. It is not the presence of the emperor which makes imperialism. It is the absence of the people, the want of men. Babies in their day have been emperors. A wooden image would serve the same purpose. More than once it has served it. The decline of a people can have but one cause, the decline in the type from which it draws its sires. A herd of cattle can degenerate in no other way than this, and a race of men is under the same laws. By the rise in absolute power, as a sort of historical barometer, we may mark the decline in the breed of the people. We see this in the history of Rome. The conditional power of Julius Cæsar, resting on his own tremendous personality, showed that the days were past of Cincinnatus and of Junius Brutus. The power of Augustus showed the same. But the decline went on. It is written that "the little finger of Constantine was thicker than the loins of Augustus." The emperor in the time of Claudius and Caligula was not the strong man who held in

check all lesser men and organizations. He was the creature of the mob, and the mob, intoxicated with its own work, worshipped him as divine. Doubtless the last emperor, Augustulus Romulus, before he was thrown into the scrap heap of history, was regarded in the mob's eyes and his own as the most godlike of them all.

What have the historians to say of these matters? Very few have grasped the full significance of their own words, for very few have looked on men as organisms, and on nations as dependent on the specific character of the organisms destined for their reproduction.

So far as I know, Benjamin Franklin was the first to think of man thus as an inhabitant, a species in nature among other species and dependent on nature's forces as other animals and other inhabitants must be.

In Otto Seeck's great history of "The Downfall of the Ancient World" (Der Untergang der Antiken Welt), he finds this downfall due solely to the rooting out of the best ("Die Ausrottung der Besten"). The historian of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" or any other empire is engaged solely with the details of the process by which the best men are exterminated. Speaking of Greece, Dr. Seeck says, "A wealth of force of spirit went down in the suicidal wars." "In Rome, Marius and Cinna slew the aristocrats by hundreds and thousands. Sulla destroyed the democrats, and not less thoroughly. Whatever of strong blood survived, fell as an offering to the proscription of the Triumvirate." "The Romans had less of spontaneous force to lose than the Greeks. Thus desolation came to them sooner. Whoever was bold enough to rise politically in Rome was almost without exception thrown to the ground. *Only cowards remained and from their brood came forward the new generations.* Cowardice showed itself in lack of originality and in slavish following of masters and traditions."

The Romans of the republic could not have made the history of the Roman empire. In their hands it would have been still a republic. Could they have held aloof from world-conquering schemes, Rome might have remained a republic, en-

during even to our own day. The seeds of destruction lie not in the race nor in the form of government, but in the influences by which the best men are cut off from the work of parenthood.

"The Roman empire," says Seeley, "perished for want of men." The dire scarcity of men is noted even by Julius Cæsar. And at the same time it is noted that there are men enough. Rome was filling up like an overflowing marsh. Men of a certain type were plenty, "people with guano in their composition," to use Emerson's striking phrase, but the self-reliant farmers, the hardy dwellers on the flanks of the Apennines, the Roman men of the early Roman days, these were fast going, and with the change in the breed came the change in Roman history.

"The mainspring of the Roman army for centuries had been the patient strength and courage, capacity for enduring hardships, instinctive submission to military discipline of the population that lined the Apennines."

With the Antonines came "a period of sterility and barrenness in human beings." "*The human harvest was bad.*" Bounties were offered for marriage. Penalties were devised against race suicide. "Marriage," says Metellus, "is a duty which, however painful, every citizen ought manfully to discharge." Wars were conducted in the face of a declining birth rate, and this decline in quality and quantity of the human harvest engaged very early the attention of the wise men of Rome.

"The effect of the wars was that the ranks of the small farmers were decimated, while the number of slaves who did not serve in the army multiplied" (Bury).

Thus "*Vir* gave place to *Homo*," real men to mere human beings. There were always men enough, such as they were. "A hencoop will be filled, whatever the (original) number of hens," said Benjamin Franklin. And thus the mob filled Rome. No wonder the mob leader, the mob hero rose in relative importance. No wonder "the little finger of Constantine was thicker than the loins of Augustus." No wonder that "if Tiberius chastised his subjects with whips, Valentinian chastised them with scorpions."

"Government, having assumed godhead, took at the same time the appurtenances of it. Officials multiplied. Subjects lost their rights. Abject fear paralyzed the people and those that ruled were intoxicated with insolence and cruelty." "The worst government is that which is most worshipped as divine." The emperor possessed in the army an overwhelming force over which citizens had no influence, which was totally deaf to reason or eloquence, which had no patriotism because it had no country, which had no humanity because it had no domestic ties." "There runs through Roman literature a brigand's and barbarian's contempt for honest industry." "Roman civilization was not a creative kind, it was military; that is, destructive." What was the end of it all? The nation bred real men no more. To cultivate the Roman fields "whole tribes were borrowed." The man of the quick eye and the strong arm gave place to the slave, the scullion, the pariah, the man with the hoe, the man whose lot does not change because in him there lies no power to change it. "Slaves have wrongs, but freemen alone have rights." So at the end the Roman world yielded to the barbaric, because it was weaker in force. "The barbarians settled and peopled the barbaric rather than conquered it." And the process is recorded in history as the fall of Rome.

"Out of every hundred thousand strong men, eighty thousand were slain. Out of every hundred thousand weaklings, ninety to ninety-five thousand were left to survive." This is Dr. Seeck's calculation, and the biological significance of such mathematics must be evident at once. Dr. Seeck speaks with scorn of the idea that Rome fell from the decay of old age, from the corruption of luxury, from neglect of military tactics or from the over-diffusion of culture.

"It is inconceivable that the mass of Romans suffered from over-culture." "In condemning the sinful luxury of wealthy Romans, we forget that the trade lords of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were scarcely inferior in this regard to Lucullus and Apicius, their waste and luxury not constituting the slightest check to the advance of the nations to which these men belonged. The people who lived in luxury in Rome

were scattered more thinly than in any modern state of Europe. The masses lived at all times more poorly and frugally because they could do nothing else. Can we conceive that a war force of untold millions of people is rendered effeminate by the luxury of a few hundreds?"

"Too long have historians looked on the rich and noble as marking the fate of the world. Half the Roman empire was made up of rough barbarians untouched by Greek or Roman culture."

"Whatever the remote and ultimate cause may have been, the immediate cause to which the fall of the empire can be traced is a physical, not a moral, decay. In valor, discipline, and science the Roman armies remained what they had always been and the peasant emperors of Illyricum were worthy successors of Cincinnatus and Caius Marius. But the problem was, how to replenish those armies. Men were wanting. The empire perished for want of men" (Seeley).

Does history ever repeat itself? It always does if it is true history. If it does not we are dealing not with history but with mere succession of incidents. Like causes produce like effects, just as often as man may choose to test them. Whenever men use a nation for the test, poor seed yields a poor fruition. Where the weakling and the coward survives in human history, there "the human harvest is bad," and it can never be otherwise.

The finest Roman province, a leader in the Roman world, was her colony of Hispania. What of Spain in history? What of Spain to-day? "This is Castile," said a Spanish writer, "she makes men and wastes them." "This sublime and terrible phrase," says another writer, "sums up Spanish history."

In 1630, according to Captain Calkins, the Augustinian friar, La Puente, thus summed up the fate of Spain:

"Against the credit for redeemed souls, I set the cost of armadas and the sacrifice of soldiers and friars sent to the Philippines. And this I count the chief loss: for mines give silver and forests give timber, but only Spain gives Spaniards, and she may give so many that she may be left desolate and constrained to bring up strangers' children instead of her own."

Another of the noblest of Roman provinces was Gallia, the

favored land, in which the best of the Romans, the Franks, and the Northmen have mingled their blood to produce a nation of men, hopefully leaders in the arts of peace, fatally leaders also in the arts of war.

To-day we are told by Frenchmen that France is a decadent nation. This is a confession of judgment, not an accusation of hostile rivals. It does not mean that the slums of Paris are destructive of human life. That we know elsewhere. Each great city has its great burdens, and these fall hard on those at the bottom of the layers of society. There is degradation in all great cities, but the great cities are not the whole of France. It is claimed that the decadence is deep-seated, not individual. It is said that the birth rate is steadily falling, that the average stature of men is lower by two inches at least than it was a century ago, that the physical force is less among the peasants at their homes. Legoyt tells us that "it will take long periods of peace and plenty before France can recover the tall statures mowed down in the wars of the republic and the first empire." What is the cause of all this? Intemperance, vice, misdirected education, bureaucracy, and the rush toward ready-made careers? These may be symptoms. They are not causes. Demolins asks in that clever volume of his: "In what constitutes the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon?" Before we answer this, let us inquire in what constitutes the inferiority of the Latin races. If we admit this inferiority exists in any degree, and if we answer it in any degree, we find in the background the causes of the fall of Greece, the fall of Rome, the fall of Spain. We find the spirit of domination, the spirit of glory, the spirit of war, the final survival of subserviency, of cowardice, and of sterility. The man who is left holds in his grasp the history of the future. The evolution of a race is always selective, never collective. Collective evolution among men or beasts, the movement upward or downward of the whole as a whole, irrespective of training or selection does not exist. As Lepouge has said, "It exists in rhetoric, not in truth nor in history."

The survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence is the primal moving cause of race progress and of race changes.

In the red stress of human history, this natural process of selection is sometimes reversed. A reversal of selection is the beginning of degradation. It is degradation itself. Can we see the fall of Rome in the downfall of France? Let us look again at the history. A single short part of it will be enough. It will give us the clew to the rest.

In the Wiertz gallery in Brussels is a wonderful painting, dating from the time of Waterloo, called Napoleon in Hell. It represents the great marshal with folded arms and face unmoved descending slowly to the land of the shades. Before him, filling all the background of the picture with every expression of countenance, are the men sent before him by the unbridled ambition of Napoleon. Three millions and seventy thousand there were in all—so history tells us, more than half of them Frenchmen. They are not all shown in one picture. They are only hinted at. And behind the millions shown or hinted at are the millions on millions of men who might have been and are not—the huge widening human wedge of the possible descendants of the men who fell in battle. These men of Napoleon's armies were the youth without blemish, "the best that the nation could bring," chosen as "food for powder," "ere evening to be trampled like the grass," in the rush of Napoleon's great battles. These men came from the plough, from the work shop, from the school, the best there were—those from eighteen to thirty-five years of age at first, but afterward the older and the younger. "A boy will stop a bullet as well as a man"; this maxim is accredited to Napoleon. "The more vigorous and well born a young man is," says Novicow, "the more normally constituted, the greater his chance to be slain by musket or magazine, the rifled cannon and other similar engines of civilization." Among those destroyed by Napoleon were "the élite of Europe." "Napoleon," says Otto Seeck, "in a series of years seized all the youth of high stature and left them scattered over many battlefields, so that the French people who followed them are mostly men of smaller stature. More than once in France since Napoleon's time has the military limit been lowered."

I need not tell again the story of Napoleon's campaigns. It

began with the United States, the justice and helpfulness of the Code Napoléon, the prowess of the brave lieutenant whose military skill and intrepidity had caused him to deserve well of his nation.

The spirit of freedom gave way to the spirit of domination. The path of glory is one which descends easily. Campaign followed campaign, against enemies, against neutrals, against friends. The trail of glory crossed the Alps to Italy and to Egypt, crossed Switzerland to Austria, crossed Germany to Russia. Conscription followed victory, and victory and conscription debased the human species. "*The human harvest was bad.*" The First Consul became the Emperor. The servant of the people became the founder of the dynasty. Again conscription after conscription. "Let them die with arms in their hands. Their death is glorious, and it will be avenged. You can always fill the places of soldiers." These were Napoleon's words when Dupont surrendered his army in Spain to save the lives of a doomed battalion.

More conscription. After the battle of Wagram, we are told, the French began to feel their weakness; the Grand Army was not the army which fought at Ulm and Jena. "Raw conscripts raised before their time and hurriedly drafted into the line had impaired its steadiness."

On to Moscow,[1] "amidst ever-deepening misery they struggled on, until of the 600,000 men who had proudly crossed the Niemen for the conquest of Russia, only 20,000 famished, frost-bitten, unarmed spectres staggered across the bridge of Korno in the middle of December."

"Despite the loss of the most splendid army marshalled by man, Napoleon abated no whit of his resolve to dominate Germany and discipline Russia." ". . . He strained every effort to call the youth of the empire to arms . . . and 350,000 conscripts were promised by the Senate. The mighty swirl of the Moscow campaign sucked in 150,000 lads of under twenty years of age into the devouring vortex." "The peasantry gave up their sons as food for cannon." But "many were

[1]These quotations are from the "History of Napoleon I," by J. H. Rose.

appalled at the frightful drain on the nation's strength." "In less than half a year after the loss of half a million men a new army nearly as numerous was marshalled under the imperial eagles. But the majority were young, untrained troops, and it was remarked that the conscripts born in the year of Terror had not the stamina of the earlier levies. Brave they were, superbly brave, and the Emperor sought by every means to breathe into them his indomitable spirit." "Truly the Emperor could make boys heroes, but he could never repair the losses of 1812." "Soldiers were wanting, youths were dragged forth." The human harvest was at its very worst.

And the sequel of it all is the decadence of France. In the presence of war—of war on such a mighty, ruthless, and ruinous scale—one does not have to look far to find in what constitutes the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon. And we see the truth in Franklin's words, the deeper truth of their deeper wisdom: "Men do not pay for war in war time; the bill comes later."

Another wise man, Ralph Waldo Emerson, has used these words: "Man has but one future, and that is predetermined in his lobes." "All the privilege and all the legislation in the world cannot meddle or help. How shall a man escape from his ancestors or draw off from his veins the black drop?"

It is related that Guizot once asked this question of James Russell Lowell: "How long will the republic endure?" "So long as the ideas of its founders remain dominant," was the answer. But again we have the question: "How long will the ideas of its founders remain dominant?" Just so long as the blood of the founders remains dominant in the blood of its people. Not necessarily the blood of the Puritans and the Virginians alone, the original creators of the land of free states. We must not read our history so narrowly as that. It is the blood of free-born men, be they Roman, Frank, Saxon, Norman, Dane, Goth, or Samurai. It is a free stock which creates a free nation. Our republic shall endure so long as the human harvest is good, so long as the movement of history, the progress of peace and industry leaves for the future not the worst but the best of each generation. The republic of Rome lasted so long as there were Romans, the republic of America will last

so long as its people, in blood and in spirit, remain what we have learned to call Americans.

By the law of probabilities as developed by Quetelet, there will appear in each generation the same number of potential poets, artists, investigators, patriots, athletes, and superior men of each degree.

But this law involves the theory of continuity of paternity, that in each generation a percentage practically equal of men of superior force or superior mentality should survive to take the responsibilities of parenthood. Otherwise Quetelet's law becomes subject to the operation of another law, the operation of reversed selection, or the biological "law of diminishing returns." In other words, breeding from an inferior stock is the sole agency in race degeneration, as selection, natural or artificial along one line or another, is the sole agency in race progress.

And all laws of probabilities and of averages are subject to a still higher law, the primal law of biology, which no cross-current of life can overrule or modify: *Like the seed is the harvest.*

ABOUT WAR

BY

Carl Schurz

Let us imagine the first news of the destruction of the "Maine" in the harbor of Havana had been accompanied by clear proof that the catastrophe was caused by a torpedo or a mine —what would have been the duty of our Government? Would it have been to rush forthwith into a war with Spain upon the assumption that Spanish officials and, with them, the Spanish Government were responsible for the calamity? Or would it not rather have been to inquire whether Spanish officials were really responsible, and, if they were found to be, whether the Spanish Government were willing or not to make due atonement for the acts of its agents? What man of good sense and of sound moral instincts would wish that war be resorted to while an honorable adjustment seems attainable? And yet

a resort to war is on every possible occasion spoken of, not only by the miscreants with whom the stirring up of a war excitement is a mere business speculation, but even by otherwise rational and respectable persons, with a flippancy as if war were nothing more serious than an international yacht race or a football-match.

That war has in the history of mankind sometimes served good purposes in forming nations, in repressing barbarism, in enforcing justice, in removing obstructions to the spread of civilization, will hardly be denied by anybody. How much of such work is still to be done, and how far the instrumentality of war may still be required to that end, it is needless to discuss here. In any event, it will be admitted that whatever object is to be accomplished, war is to be regarded as the last expedient to be resorted to, and not the first.

What does civilization mean if not the progress from the arbitrament of brute force to the arbitrament of reason and the maintenance of justice by peaceable methods in the righting of wrongs, and in the settlement of conflicting opinions or interests? If it were proposed to abolish our courts, and to remand the decision of difficulties between man and man to trial by single combat, or by street fight between armed bands enlisted by the contending parties, it would be called a relapse into barbarism too absurd as well as too dreadful to be thought of. We denounce the application of lynch law as a practice utterly repugnant to the fundamental principles of civilized life, and as a blot upon the character of a civilized people. What a strange anachronism it is that, while we abhor the arbitrary resort to brute force in private life as a crime against human society, the same arbitrary resort to brute force in deciding differences between nation and nation, although infinitely more horrible in its effects, has still remained the custom of the civilized world, and is surrounded with a halo of heroic romance! It may, indeed, be said that it is far more difficult to find and institute practical methods for the peaceable adjustment of some kinds of disputes between nations than between individuals, so that occasionally war remains the only expedient. This is true, just as it is true that occasionally

the social order may become so disturbed that the individual man has no refuge for the protection of his rights except in self-help outside of the rule of law. But in each case this should be regarded only as the very last extremity when everything else fails.

General Sherman once said: "You would know what war is? War is hell." He knew what he was speaking of, and he meant it. Was it an exaggeration? When the news of the destruction of the "Maine" arrived we threw up our hands in horror. Two hundred and fifty men killed by the explosion! What a frightful calamity! Thus we feel, and thus we speak, in a state of peace. How in time of war? Two hundred and fifty men killed? Only a skirmish, a slight brush with the enemy. Nothing of importance. A pitched battle comes. Five thousand killed and fifteen thousand wounded on our side; the loss of the enemy believed to be greater. A hard fight, but, perhaps, not decisive. Then more battles; more thousands of killed, more tens of thousands of wounded; the hospitals crowded with countless multitudes of sick. Naval fights also; of those mysterious monsters called battleships some go to the bottom of the sea, some of our own as well as some of the enemy's. How many men perish with them? Two hundred and fifty? A mere trifle. It must be many times two hundred and fifty to make a sensation. What is then our first thought? The gaps must be filled, and more of our young men are sent to the front and upon the ships. And the crowds of parents made childless, and of widows and orphans! "Well, very sad, but war is war. Let us take care of them the best way we can to keep them from starving." But more than this. Wherever the armies operate, devastation, ravage, and ruin; wherever the warships sail, destruction of commerce and mutual havoc —the fruit of years of patient industry and exertion ruthlessly wiped out; and those agencies of intercourse and mutual advancement by which modern civilization has made the nations of the world dependent upon one another disastrously interrupted, and loss, desolation, and misery spread broadcast. Was General Sherman wrong when he said that "war is hell"?

But we are told that a nation needs a war from time to

time to prevent it from becoming effeminate, to shake it up from demoralizing materialism, and to elevate the popular heart by awakening heroic emotions and the spirit of patriotic self-sacrifice. This has a captivating sound. But is there not something intensely ludicrous in the idea that the American people, while the rugged work of subduing this vast continent to civilization is yet unfinished, need wars to save them from effeminacy? Were we more effeminate before our Civil War than we have been since? As to the demoralizing materialism, was the pursuit of money, the greed of material possession and enjoyment, less prevalent after the Civil War than before it? Did not the war itself stimulate that "materialism" to a degree not known among us before? As to heroic emotions and the spirit of patriotic self-sacrifice, it is true that war is apt to call forth splendid manifestations of them. But does war *create* those noble impulses? Could it bring out the manifestations of them if they did not, although unmanifested, already exist? And is, after all, the readiness to die for one's country the sum of all bravery? Is there no call for heroic emotions and patriotic self-sacrifice in a state of peace? Is not a patient and faithful struggle for the truth against the fanaticism of prejudice, and for justice against arrogant power, as brave a feat as the storming of a battery? And is not that civic virtue more rare than the physical courage of the soldier, and, on the whole, more needful to the republic? On the other hand, while war calls forth demonstrations of heroic spirit, does it not also stimulate the baser passions of a larger number? Have we ever heard of a war which, whatever great objects it may otherwise have served, improved private or public morals or stimulated the cultivation of those quiet and unostentatious civic virtues which are most needful to the vitality of free government?

But we are told that there are things worse than war. No doubt. Loss of honor and self-respect, for instance. Surely we should not tamely accept a deliberate insult; but neither should we by offensive bluster provoke one. We should preserve our self-respect, but also respect the self-respect of others. We should not submit to manifest wrong, but we should not

forget that others too have rights; and we must not see a wrong irremediable, except by war, in every difference of opinion or clash of interest. Whenever the question of redress or remedy is to be settled, we should not forget that "war is hell," and that a war honorably averted is a nobler achievement than a battle won.

But will not this horror of war at last make cringing cowards of us all? No danger of that. Whatever our love of peace, when the republic needs defenders, hundreds of thousands of her sons will eagerly rush to arms, and the people will pour forth their wealth without stint, no matter if "war is hell." Of this there will never be doubt. No peace feeling can emasculate our patriotism. The danger lies in the opposite direction. It is that the popular mind may too easily forget that war is justifiable only when all resources of statesmanship to avert it have been exhausted, and when the true value of the object to be accomplished through it outweighs the blood and loss of wealth and human misery and demoralization it will cost. This being the temper of a high-spirited people, so much more do the fiends who seek to drive the nation into unnecessary war by false reports or by unscrupulous appeals to prejudice and passion deserve to be execrated by all good men, and so much more gratitude is due to those in power who, firmly resisting the screams of a reckless demagogy, know no higher duty than to spare the people the scourge of war so long as the blessing of peace can honorably be preserved.

XXXII

ARBITRATION

"A LEAGUE OF PEACE"

BY

ANDREW CARNEGIE, LL.D.

LORD RECTOR OF ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITY

IF war be indeed, as both President Jordan and Mr. Schurz have urged upon us, an economic blunder as well as a crime, a costly folly at its best, and brutal murder at its worst, what chance is there that we may escape it wholly, that some day it may become, as slavery and darker nameless evils have become, a crudity of the barbaric past, the last outgrown relic of the ape-man, whose very existence depended on the fierceness of tooth and claw? We have all heard more or less doubtfully and dubiously of recent peace congresses, most of us with little hope of their achieving practical results. No busy man has read or heard all the eloquent speeches delivered at all the sessions of this kind. But let us take one only of these, the practical outlook of an eminently practical man. When recently the University of St. Andrew's in his native Scotland conferred on Mr. Carnegie the high honor of re-electing him its Rector, he chose the occasion of his inaugural, when he knew that all the world would be listening and intent, he chose that occasion to explain fully the practical outlook of what he hoped might be achieved toward universal peace. We deal here, therefore, with no vague theories, no flights of poetic fancy, but with earnest, simple truth. For all who would know what peace congresses really mean, the address is worth studying.

Principal and Students of St. Andrew's: My first words must be words of thanks, very grateful thanks, to those who have so kindly re-elected me their Rector without a contest. The honor is deeply appreciated, I assure you. There is one feature, at least, connected with your choice upon which I may venture to congratulate you, and also the university—the continuance of the services of my able and zealous assessor, Dr. Ross of Dunfermline, which I learn are highly valued.

My young constituents, you are busily preparing to play your parts in the drama of life, resolved, I trust, to oppose and attack what is evil, to defend and strengthen what is good, and, if possible, to leave your part of the world a little better than you found it. You are already pondering over the career you will pursue, what problems you will study, upon what, and how, your powers can be most profitably exerted; and apart from the choice of a career I trust you ask yourself what are the evils of this life, in which all our duties lie, which you should most strenuously endeavor to eradicate or at least to lessen,—what causes you will espouse, giving preference to these beyond all other public questions, for the student of St. Andrew's is expected to devote both time and labor to his duties as a citizen, whatever his professional career. You will find the world much better than your forefathers did. There is profound satisfaction in this, that all grows better; but there is still one evil in our day, so far exceeding any other in extent and effect, that I venture to bring it to your notice.

Polygamy and slavery have been abolished by civilized nations. Duelling no longer exists where English is spoken. The right of private war and of privateering have passed away. Many other beneficent abolitions have been made in various fields; but there still remains the foulest blot that has ever disgraced the earth, the killing of civilized men by men like wild beasts as a permissible mode of settling international disputes, although in Rousseau's words, "War is the foulest fiend ever vomited forth from the mouth of hell." As such, it has received from the earliest times, in each successive age till now, the fiercest denunciations of the holiest, wisest, and best of men.

Homer, about eight hundred and fifty years before Christ, tells us it is by no means fit for a man stained with blood and gore to pray to the gods, and that "Religious, social, and domestic ties alike he violates, who willingly would court the honors of internal strife." ("Illiad," IX., 63.)

He makes Zeus, the Cloud-Gatherer, look sternly at Ares, the God of War, saying: "Nay, thou renegade, sit not by me and whine. Most hateful art thou to me of all the gods that dwell in Olympus; thou ever lovest strife, and wars, and battles." ("Iliad," V., line 891.)

Euripides, 480–406 B.C., cries: "Hapless mortals, why do ye get your spears and deal out death to fellow-men? Stay! from such work forbear!" . . . "Oh fools all ye who try to win the meed of valor through war, seeking thus to still this mortal coil, for, if bloody contests are to decide, strife will never cease!"

Thucydides, who wrote his great work sometime between 423 B.C. and 403 B.C., asserts that "Wars spring from unseen and generally insignificant causes, the first outbreak being often but an explosion of anger." And he gives us the needed lesson for our day which should be accepted as an axiom: "It is wicked to proceed against him as a wrongdoer who is ready to refer the question to arbitration." Aristides praised Pericles, because, to avoid war, "he is willing to accept arbitration."

Andocides, about 440–388 B.C., says: "Then this is the distinction, Athenians, which I draw between the two: peace means security for the people, war inevitable downfall."

Isocrates, 436–338 B.C., teaches that "Peace should be made with all mankind. It should be our care not only to make peace, but to maintain it. But this will never be until we are persuaded that quiet is better than disturbance, justice than injustice, the care of our own than grasping at what belongs to others." ("Oration on Peace.")

The sacred books of the east make peace their chief concern. "Thus does he (Buddha) live as a binder together of those who are divided, an encourager of those who are friends, a peacemaker, a lover of peace, impassioned for peace, a speaker of words that make for peace." ("Buddhist Suttas," fifth century B.C.) "Now, wherein is his conduct good? Herein, that

putting away the murder of that which lives, he abstains from destroying life. The cudgel and the sword he lays aside, and, full of modesty and pity, he is compassionate and kind to all creatures that have life." ("Buddhist Suttas.")

"Truly is the King our sovereign Lord! He has regulated the position of the princes; he has called in shields and spears; he has returned to their cases bows and arrows." ("The Shik King," Decade I., Ode 10.)

Many hundred years before Christ the Zendavesta pronounces "Opposition to peace is a sin."

The Buddhist commandment, six hundred years before our era, is "Love all mankind equally."

"To those of a noble disposition, the whole world is but one family," says the Hindu.

Coming to the Romans, Cicero (106–43 B.C.) says: "War should only be undertaken by a highly civilized state to preserve either its religion or its existence." "There are two ways of ending a dispute—discussion and force: the latter manner is simply that of the brute beasts; the former is proper to beings gifted with reason." He also reminds the Senate, "For in this assembly, before the matter was decided, I said many things in favor of peace, and even while war was going on I retained the same opinions, even at the risk of my own life." No better proof of the true patriot and leader can be given than this—a lesson much needed in our day.

Sallust (86–34 B.C.) recounts: "But after the Senate learned of the war between them, three young men were chosen to go out to Africa to both Kings, and in the words of the Senate, and of the people, announce to them that it was their will and advice that they lay down their arms and 'settle their disputes by arbitration rather than by the sword; since to act thus would be to the honor both of the Romans and themselves.'" ("Jugurtha," XXI., 4.)

Virgil (70–19 B.C.) laments that "The love of arms and the mad wickedness of war are raging. . . . As for me, just come from war and reeking with fresh slaughter, it would be criminal for me to touch the gods till I shall have washed the pollution in the running stream."

From Seneca (4 B.C.–65 A.D.) we have this outburst: "We punish murders and massacres among private persons; what do we respecting wars, and the glorious crime of murdering whole nations?" . . . "The love of a conquest is a murderess. Conquerers are scourges not less harmful to humanity than floods and earthquakes."

Tacitus shrewdly observes: "To be sure every wicked man has the greatest power in stirring up tumult and discord; peace and quiet need the qualities of good men." ("Historiæ," IV., 1.) This is why the demagogue comes to the surface, to inflame the passions of the multitude, that he may ride to power upon them. Beware of the man who leads you into war.

Josephus, born only thirty-eight years after Christ, writes: "David said, 'I was willing to build God a temple myself, but he prohibited me, because I was polluted with blood and wars.' "

Plutarch, born 46 A.D., holds that "There is no war among men not born of wickedness; some are aroused by desire of pleasures, others by too great eagerness for influence and power."

Such are a few examples from the testimony of the ancients.

I now solicit your attention to the views held and expressed by the early Christian fathers, which cannot but be of special importance to such of you as are theological students.

Justin Martyr, who died about 165 A.D., proclaims: "That the prophecy is fulfilled we have good reason to believe, for we (Christians), who in the past killed one another, do not now fight our enemies."

St. Irenæus, about 140–202 A.D., boasts that "The Christians have changed their swords and their lances into instruments of peace, and they know not how to fight."

Clement of Alexandria, whose works were composed in the end of the second century and beginning of the third, writes: "The followers of Christ use none of the implements of war."

Tertullian, about 150–230 A.D., asks: "How shall a Christian go to war, how shall he carry arms in time of peace, when the Lord has forbidden the sword to us? . . . Jesus Christ,

in disarming St. Peter, disarmed all soldiers." ("De Idololatr.," 19.) "The military oath and the baptismal vow are inconsistent with each other, the one being the sign of Christ, the other of the Devil." . . . "Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword?"

Origen, 185–254 A.D., says: "The angels wonder that peace is come through Jesus to earth, for it is a place ridden with wars." "This is called peace, where none is at variance, nothing is out of harmony, where there is nothing hostile, nothing barbarian." "For no longer do we (Christians) take arms against any race, or learn to wage war, inasmuch as we have been made sons of peace through Jesus, whom we follow as our leader." ("Patrologia Græca," XIV., pp. 46, 988, 1231.)

St. Cyprian, about 200–257 A.D., boasts that "Christians do not in turn assail their assailants, since it is not lawful for the innocent even to kill the guilty; but they readily deliver up their lives and blood." (Epistle 56, to Cornelius, section 2.)

Arnobius, who wrote about 295 A.D., says: "Certainly, if all who look upon themselves as men would listen a while unto Christ's wholesome and peaceable decrees, the whole world long ago, turning the use of iron to milder works, should have lived in most quiet tranquillity, and have met together in a firm and indissoluble league of most safe concord." ("Adversus Gentes," Lib. I., page 6.)

Lactantius, who wrote in the beginning of the fourth century, insists that "It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war, for his warfare is unrighteous itself." "It is not murder that God rebukes; the civil laws punish that. God's prohibition is intended for those acts which men considered lawful. Therefore it is not permitted for a Christian to bear arms; justice is his armor. The divine command admits no exceptions; man is sacred and it is always a crime to take his life." ("Div. Inst.," VI., 20.) Thus does he declaim against men-slayers: "This, then, is your road to immortality. To destroy cities, devastate territories, exterminate or enslave free peoples! The more you have ruined, robbed, and murdered

men, the more you think yourselves noble and illustrious." ("Div. Inst.," I., 48.)

Athanasius, 296–373 A.D., states that when people "hear the teaching of Christ, straightway instead of fighting they turn to husbandry, and instead of arming their hands with weapons they raise them in prayer." ("Incarnation of the Word," section 52.)

St. Gregory of Nyssa, 335–395 A.D., preaches that "He who promises you profit, if you abstain from the ills of war, bestows on you two gifts—one the remission from the train of evils attendant on the strife, the other the strife itself." ("Patrologia Græca," XLIV., p. 1282.)

St. Augustine, 354–430 A.D., declares that "Not to keep peace is to spurn Christ." ("Migne's Patrologia Latina," XXXIII., p. 186.) He holds that "defensive wars are the only just and lawful ones; it is in these alone that the soldier may be allowed to kill, when he cannot otherwise protect his city and his brethren." (Letter 47.)

Isidore of Pelusium, 370–450 A.D., is no less outspoken: "I say, although the slaughter of enemies in war may seem legitimate, although the columns to the victors are erected, telling of their illustrious crimes, yet if account be taken of the undeniable and supreme brotherhood of man, not even these are free from evil." ("Patrologia Græca," LXXVIII., p. 1287.)

We have also the undisputed historical record of Maximilian, the centurion, who, having embraced Christianity, resigned his position and refused to fight. For this he was put to death.

Celsus, the great opponent of Christianity, who wrote about 176 A.D., reproaches the Christians for refusing to bear arms, and states that in one part of the Roman army, including one-third of the whole, "Not a Christian could be found."

Martin replied to Julian the Apostate, "I am a Christian, and I cannot fight."

If we turn to the Popes, who were then supreme:

St. Gregory the Great, 540–604 A.D., writes the King of the Lombards, "By choosing peace you have shown yourself a lover of God, who is its author."

Pope Innocent III., to the King of France, in protest against the wars between Philip Augustus and Richard of England, writes: "At the moment when Jesus Christ is about to complete the mystery of redemption, He gives peace as a heritage to His disciples; He wills that they observe it among themselves and make it observed by others. What He says at His death, He confirms after His resurrection. 'Peace be with you.' These are the first words which He addressed to His Apostles. Peace is the expression of that love which is the fulfilling of the law. What is more contrary to love than the quarrels of men? Born of hate, they destroy every bond of affection; and shall he who loves not his neighbor love God?"

Erasmus declares: "If there is in the affairs of mortal men any one thing which it is proper to explode, and incumbent upon every man by every lawful means to avoid, to deprecate, to oppose, that one thing is doubtless war."

Luther declares: "Cannons and firearms are cruel and damnable machines. I believe them to have been the direct suggestion of the devil. If Adam had seen in vision the horrible instruments his children were to invent, he would have died of grief."

Nothing can be clearer than that the leaders of Christianity immediately succeeding Christ, from whom authentic expressions of doctrines have come down to us, were well assured that their Master had forbidden to the Christian the killing of men in war or enlisting in the legions. One of the chief differences which separated Roman non-Christians and Christians was the refusal of the latter to enlist in the legions and be thus bound to kill their fellows in war as directed. We may well ponder over the change, and wonder that Christian priests accompany the armies of our day, and even dare to approach the Unknown, beseeching his protection and favor for soldiers in their heinous work. When the warring hosts are Christian nations, worshipping the one God, which, alas, is not seldom, as in the last gigantic orgy of human slaughter in Europe, we had the spectacle of the rival priests, praying in the name of the Prince of Peace, to the God of Battles for favor. Similar prayers were offered in the churches, where in some instances battleflags, the emblems

of carnage, were displayed. Future ages are to pronounce all this blasphemous. There are those of to-day who deplore it deeply. Even the pagan, before Christ, direct from human butchery, refrained from appealing to his gods without first cleansing himself of the accruing pollution.

It is a truism that the doctrines of all founders of religions have undergone modifications in practice, but it is strange indeed that the doctrine of Christ regarding war and warriors, as held by his immediate followers, should have been so completely discarded and reversed in the later centuries, and is so still.

Bentham's words cannot be overlooked: "Nothing can be worse than the general feeling on the subject of war. The church, the state, the ruling few, the subject man, all seem in this case to have combined to patronize vice and crime in their widest sphere of evil. Dress a man in particular garments, call him by a particular name, and he shall have authority, on divers occasions, to commit every species of offence—to pillage, to murder, to destroy human felicity; and for so doing he shall be rewarded. The period will surely arrive when better instructed generations will require all the evidence of history to credit that, in times deeming themselves enlightened, human beings should have been honored with public approval in the very proportion of the misery they caused."

Bacon's words come to mind: "I am of opinion that, except you bray Christianity in a mortar and mould it into new paste, there is no possibility of a holy war."

Apparently in no field of its work in our times does the Christian church throughout the whole world, with outstanding individual exceptions of course, so conspicuously fail as in its attitude to war—judged by the standard maintained by the early Christian fathers nearest in time to Christ. Its silence when outspoken speech might avert war, its silence during war's sway, its failure even during calm days of peace to proclaim the true Christian doctrine regarding the killing of men made in God's image, and the prostitution of its holy offices to unholy warlike ends, give point to the recent arraignment of Prime Minister Balfour, who declared that the church to-day busies

itself with questions which do not weigh even as dust in the balance compared with the vital problems with which it is called upon to deal.

Volumes could be filled with the denunciations of war by the great moderns. Only a few can be given.

Lord Clarendon, 1608–1674, says: "We cannot make a more lively representation and emblem to ourselves of hell than by the view of a kingdom in war."

Hume says: "The rage and violence of public war, what is it but a suspension of justice among the warring parties?"

Gibbon writes: "A single robber or a few associates are branded with their genuine name; but the exploits of a numerous band assume the character of lawful and honorable war."

"In every battlefield we see an inglorious arena of human degradation," says Conway.

A strong voice from a St. Andrew's principal is heard. Sir David Brewster, 1781–1868, says: "Nothing in the history of the species appears more inexplicable than that war, the child of barbarism, should exist in an age enlightened and civilized. But it is more inexplicable still that war should exist where Christianity has for nearly two thousand years been shedding its gentle light, and should be defended by arguments drawn from the Scriptures themselves."

One of the greatest American secretaries of state, Col. John Hay, who has lately passed away, denounced war as "the most futile and ferocious of human follies."

Much has man accomplished in his upward march from savagery. Much that was evil and disgraceful has been banished from life; but the indelible mark of war still remains to stain the earth and discredit our claim to civilization. After all our progress, human slaughter is still with us; but I ask your attention for a few minutes to many bright rays, piercing the dark cloud, which encourage us. Consider for a moment what war was in days past. It knew no laws, had no restrictions. Poison and assassination of opposing rulers and generals arranged by private bargain, and deceptive agreements, were legitimate weapons. Prisoners were massacred or enslaved. No quarter was given. Enemies were tortured and mutilated.

Women, children, and non-combatants were not spared. Wells were poisoned. Private property was not respected. Pillage was the rule. Privateering and private war were allowed. Neutral rights at sea were almost unknown.

Permit me briefly to trace the history of the reforms in war which have been achieved, from which we draw encouragement to labor for its abolition, strong in the faith that the days of man-slaying are numbered.

The first action against the savage custom of war is found in the rules of the Amphictyonic Council of the Greeks, some three hundred years before Christ. Hellenes were "to quarrel as those who intend some day to be reconciled." They were to "use friendly correction, and not to devastate Hellas or burn houses, or think that the whole population of a city, men, women, and children, were equally their enemies and therefore to be destroyed."

We owe chiefly to Grotius the modern movement to subject hitherto lawless war on land and sea to the humane restraints of law. His first book, "Mare Liberum," appeared in 1609. It soon attracted such attention that Britain had to employ her greatest legal authority, Lord Selden, to make reply. Up to this time Spain, Portugal, and Britain had maintained that the surrounding seas were closed to all countries except those upon their shores, a doctrine not formally abandoned by Britain until 1803.

Grotius's second and epoch-making work, "The Rights of War and Peace," appeared in 1625, and immediately arrested the attention of Gustavus Adolphus, the greatest warrior of his time. A copy was found in his tent when he died on the field of Lützen. He stood constantly for mercy, even in those barbarous days. Three years after its appearance, Cardinal Richelieu, to the amazement of Europe, spared the Huguenot garrison and protected the city of Rochelle, when he was expected to follow the usual practice of massacring the defenders and giving the town and inhabitants over to massacre and pillage. It was then holy work to slay heretics, sparing not one. He was denounced for this merciful act by his own party and hailed as "Cardinal of Satan" and "Pope of the Atheists."

The Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, three years after the death of Grotius, closed the Thirty Years' War in Germany, the Eighty Years' War in the Netherlands, and a long era of savagery in many parts of the globe. It shows clearly the influence of Grotius's advanced ideas, being founded upon his doctrine of the essential independence and equality of all sovereign states, and the laws of justice and mercy. In the progress of man from war lawless and savage, to war restricted and obedient to international law, no name is entitled to rank with his. He is the father of modern international law, so far as it deals with the rights of peace and war. He has had several eminent successors, especially Puffendorf, Bynkershoek, and Vattel. These four are called by Phillimore "The Umpires of International Disputes." They are followed closely by a second quartette, the British judge—Stowell, and the American judges—Marshall, Story, and Field.

International law is unique in one respect. It has no material force behind it. It is a proof of the supreme force of gentleness—the irresistible pressure and final triumph of what is just and merciful. To the few who have contributed conspicuously to its growth in the past, and to those laboring therein to-day, civilization owes an unpayable debt. Private individuals have created it, and yet the nations have been glad to accept. British judges have repeatedly declared that "International law is in full force in Britain." It is so in America and other countries. We have in this self-created, self-developing, and self-forcing agency one of the two most powerful and beneficial instruments for the peace and progress of the world.

The most important recent reforms effected in the laws of war are those of the Treaty of Paris (1856), the Treaty of Washington (1871), which settled the Alabama claims, and the Brussels Declaration of 1874.

The Treaty of Paris marks an era as having enshrined certain principles. First, it abolished privateering. Henceforth, war on the sea is confined to national warships, organized and manned by officers and men in the service of the state. Commerce is no longer subject to attack by private adventurers seeking spoil. Second, it ruled that a blockade to be recognized

must be effective. Third, it established the doctrine that an enemy's goods in a neutral ship are free, except contraband. These are great steps forward.

America declined to accept the first (in which, however, she has now concurred) unless private property was totally exempt on sea as on land, for which she has long contended, and which the powers, except Britain, have generally favored. So strongly has the current set recently in its favor that hopes are entertained that the forthcoming conference at The Hague may reach this desirable result. It is the final important advance in this direction that remains to be made, and means that peaceful commerce has been rescued from the demon war. Should it be made, the trenchers of St. Andrew's students may well whirl in the air with cheers.

The Treaty of Washington is probably to rank in history as Mr. Gladstone's greatest service, because it settled by arbitration the Alabama claims, a question fraught with danger and which, if left open, would probably have driven apart and kept hostile to each other for a long period the two branches of the English-speaking race. A statesman less powerful with the great masses of his countrymen could not have carried the healing measure, for much had to be conceded by Britain, for which it deserves infinite credit. Three propositions were insisted upon by America as a basis for arbitration, and although all were reasonable and should have been part of international law, still they were not. Their fairness being recognized, Mr. Gladstone boldly and magnanimously agreed that the arbiters should be guided by them. These defined very clearly the duties of neutrals respecting the fitting out of ships of war in their ports, or the use of their ports as a naval base. This they must now use "due diligence" to prevent.

Morley says, in his Life of Gladstone: "The Treaty of Washington and the Geneva arbitration stand out as the most noble victory in the nineteenth century of the noble art of preventive diplomacy, and the most signal exhibition in their history of self-command in two of three chief democratic powers of the Western World."

The Brussels Convention met in 1874.

Even as late as the earlier half of last century the giving up of towns and their inhabitants to the fury of the troops which stormed them was permitted by the usages of war. Defending his conduct in Spain, Wellington says: "I believe it has always been understood that defenders of a fortress stormed have no right to quarter." After the storming of San Sebastian, as to plunder, he says: "It has fallen to my lot to take many towns by storm, and I am concerned to add that I never saw nor heard of one so taken by any troops that it was not plundered."

Shakespeare's description of the stormed city can never be forgotten:

> "The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
> And the flushed soldier rough and hard
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell."

This inhuman practice was formally abolished by the Brussels Declaration—that "a town taken by storm shall not be given up to the victorious troops to plunder." To-day to put a garrison to the sword would be breach of the law of quarter, as well as a violation of the Brussels Declaration. We may rest assured the civilized world has seen the last of that atrocity.

We look back from the pinnacle of our high civilization with surprise and horror to find that even in Wellington's time, scarcely one hundred years ago, such savagery was the rule; but so shall our descendants after a like interval look back from a still higher pinnacle upon our slaying of man in war as equally atrocious, equally unnecessary, and equally indefensible.

Let me summarize what has been gained so far in mitigating the atrocities of war in our march onward to the reign of peace. Non-combatants are now spared, women and children are no longer massacred, quarter is given, and prisoners are well cared for. Towns are not given over to pillage, private property on land is exempt, or if taken is paid or receipted for. Poisoned wells, assassination of rulers and commanders by private bargain, and deceptive agreements, are infamies of the past. On the sea, privateering has been abolished, neutral rights greatly extended and property protected, and the right of search

narrowly restricted. So much is to be credited to the pacific power of international law. There is great cause for congratulation. If man has not been striking at the heart of the monster war, he has at least been busily engaged drawing some of its poisonous fangs.

Thus even throughout the savage reign of man-slaying we see the blessed law of evolution unceasingly at work performing its divine mission, making that which is better than what has been and ever leading us on toward perfection.

We have only touched the fringe of the crime so far, however, the essence of which is the slaughter of human beings, the failure to hold human life sacred, as the early Christians did.

One deplorable exception exists to the march of improvement. A new stain has recently crept into the rules of war as foul as any that war has been forced by public sentiment to discard. It is the growth of recent years. Gentilis, Grotius, and all the great publicists before Bynkershoek, dominated by the spirit of Roman law, by chivalry and long established practice, insist upon the necessity of a formal declaration of war, "that he be not taken unawares under friendly guise." Not until the beginning of the last century did the opposite view begin to find favor. To-day it is held that a formal declaration is not indispensable and that war may begin without it. Here is the only step backward to be met with in the steady progress of reforming the rules of war. It is no longer held to be contrary to these for a power to surprise and destroy while yet in friendly conference with its adversary, endeavoring to effect a peaceful settlement. It belongs to the infernal armory of assassins hired to kill or poison opposing generals, of forged despatches, poisoned wells, agreements made to be broken, and all the diabolic weapons which, for very shame, men have been forced to abandon as too infamous even for the trade of man-slaying. It proclaims that any party to a dispute can first in his right hand carry gentle peace, sitting in friendly conference, ostensibly engaged in finding a peaceful solution of differences, while with the left he grasps, concealed, the assassin's dagger. The parallel between duel and war runs very close through history. The challenger to a duel gave

the other party notice. In 1187, the German Diet at Nuremberg enacted: "We decree and enact by this edict that he who intends to damage another or to injure him shall give him notice three days before." It is to be hoped that the coming conference will stamp this treachery as contrary to the rules of war, and thus return to the ancient and more chivalrous idea of attack only after notice.

We come now to the consideration of the other commanding force in the campaign against war—peaceful arbitration.

The originator of the world-wide arbitration idea was Emeric Cruce, born at Paris about 1590. Of his small book of two hundred and twenty-six pages upon the subject only one copy exists. Gerloius had propounded the idea in the twelfth century, but it failed to attract attention. Balch says: "Cruce presented what was probably the first real proposal of substituting international arbitration for war as the court of last resort of nations." It has a quaint preface: "This book would gladly make the tour of the inhabited world so as to be seen by all the kings, and it would not fear any disgrace, having truth for its escort and the merit of its subject, which must serve as letters of recommendation and credit."

Henry IV., in 1603, produced his scheme for consolidating Europe in order to abolish war; but as its fundamental idea was armed force and involved the overthrow of the Hapsburgs, it can not be considered as in the line with the system of peaceful arbitration.

St. Pierre, the Duc de Lorraine, William Penn, the Quaker founder of Pennsylvania, Bentham, Kant, Mill, and others have labored to substitute the reign of law for war by producing schemes much alike in character, so that we have many proofs of the irrepressible longing of man for release from the scourge.

I beg now to direct your attention to the most fruitful of all conferences that have ever taken place. Other conferences have been held, but always at the end of war, and their first duty was to restore peace between the belligerents. The Hague Conference was the first ever called to discuss the means of establishing peace without reference to any particular war.

Twenty-six nations were represented, including all the leading powers.

The Conference was called by the present Emperor of Russia, August 24, 1898, and is destined to be forever memorable from having realized Cruce's ideal, and given to the world its first permanent court for the settlement of international disputes. The last century is in future ages to remain famous as having given birth to this high court of humanity. The conference opened upon the birthday of the Emperor, May 18, 1899. The day may yet become one of the world's holidays in the coming day of peace, as that upon which humanity took one of its longest and highest steps in its history, onward and upward. As Ambassador White says, "The Conference marks the first stage in the abolition of the scourge of war." Such an achievement was scarcely expected, even by the most sanguine. Its accomplishment surprised most of the members of the Conference themselves; but so deeply and generally had they been appalled by the ravages of war, and its enormous cost, by its inevitable progeny of future wars, and above all by its failure to ensure lasting peace, that the idea of a world-court captivated the assembly, which has been pronounced the most distinguished that ever met. A less sweeping proposal would probably not have touched their imagination and aroused their enthusiasm. The prompt acceptance of the international court by public sentiment in all countries was no less surprising. Every one of the powers represented promptly ratified the treaty, the United States Senate voting unanimously—a rare event. We may justly accept this far-reaching and rapid success as evidence of a deep, general, and earnest desire in all lands to depose war and enthrone peace through the judicial settlement of disputes by courts.

At last there is no excuse for war. A tribunal is now at hand to judge wisely and deliver righteous judgment between nations. It has made an auspicious start. A number of disputes have already been settled by it. First, it settled a difference between the United States and Mexico. Then President Roosevelt, when asked to act as arbiter, nobly led Britain, Germany, France, Italy, America, and Venezuela to it for settlement of their differences.

Britain had recently a narrow escape from war with Russia, arising from the unfortunate incident upon the Dogger Bank, when fishing boats were struck by shots from Russian war-ships. There was intense excitement. The Hague Treaty provides that when such difficulties arise international commissions of inquiry be formed. This was the course pursued by two governments, parties to the treaty, which happily preserved the peace.

It was under another provision of the Hague Conference that the President of the United States addressed his recent note to Japan and Russia suggesting a conference looking to peace, and offering his services to bring it about. His success was thus made possible by the Hague Treaty. The world is fast awakening to its far-reaching consequences and to the fact that the greatest advance man has ever made by one act is the creation of a world-court to settle international disputes.

As I write, report comes that to-morrow the august tribunal is to begin hearing France and Britain upon their differences regarding Muscat. There sits the divinest conclave that ever graced the earth, judged by its mission, which is the fulfilment of the prophecy, "Men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Thus the world-court goes marching on, to the dethronement of savage war and the enthronement of peaceful arbitration.

The Hague tribunal has nothing compulsory about it; all members are left in perfect freedom as to whether they submit questions to it or not. This has sometimes been regarded as its weakness, but it is, from another point of view, its strongest feature. Like international law, it depends upon its merits to win its way, and, as we have seen, it is succeeding; but so anxious are many to hasten the abolition of war that suggestions are made toward obtaining the consent of the powers to agree to submit to it certain classes of questions. In this it may be well to make haste slowly and refrain from exerting pressure. This will all come in good time. Peace wins her way not by force; her appeal is to the reason and the conscience of man.

In all treaties hitherto the great powers have retained power to withhold submission of questions affecting "their honor or vital interests." This was only natural at first, and time is required gradually to widen the range of subjects to be submitted. The tendency to do this is evident, and it only needs patience to reach the desired end. The greatest step forward in this direction is that Denmark and the Netherlands and Chili and Argentina have just concluded treaties agreeing to submit to arbitration all disputes, making no exception whatever. To crown this noble work, the latter two have erected a statue to the Prince of Peace on the highest peak of the Andes, which marks the long-disputed boundary between them.

Another splendid advance in this direction has been made in the agreement to arbitrate all questions between Sweden and Norway. Questions affecting "independence, integrity, or vital interests" are excepted; but should any difference arise as to what to do, that question is to be submitted. In other words, either nation can claim that a question does so, and, if the Hague tribunal agrees, it is not arbitrated. But if the tribunal decides the difference does not concern the "independence, integrity, or vital interests of either country," then it is submitted to arbitration. This is certainly a step forward; and you will please note that intangible thing—"honor"—is omitted.

These nations are to be cordially congratulated on taking the initial step in this splendid advance. We grudge not the honor and glory that have fallen to them therefrom, though in our hearts we may feel that this might more appropriately have been the work of the race that abolished slavery, both branches participating, and also abolished the duel. What our race should now do is to follow the example set and conclude such a treaty, operative within the wide boundaries of English-speakers, empire and republic. Less than this were derogatory to our past as pioneers of progress. We cannot long permit these small nations to march in advance. We should at least get abreast of them.

We have noted that honor or vital interests have hitherto been excepted from submission by arbitration treaties. We

exclaim, "Oh, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!"—but these are trifling compared with those committed in the name of "honor," the most dishonored word in our language. Never did man or nation dishonor another man or nation. This is impossible. All honor's wounds are self-inflicted. All stains upon honor come from within, never from without. Innocence seeks no revenge; there is nothing to be revenged—guilt can never be. Man or nation whose honor needs vindication beyond a statement of the truth, which puts calumny to shame, is to be pitied. Innocence rests with that, truth has a quiet breast, for the guiltless find that

> "So dear to Heaven is saintly Innocence,
> A thousand liveried angels lackey her
> To keep her from all sense of sin and shame."

Innocent honor, assailed, discards bloody revenge and seeks the halls of justice and of arbitration. It has been held in the past that, a man's honor assailed, vindication lay only through the sword. To-day it is sometimes still held that a nation's honor, assailed, can in like manner be vindicated only through war; but it is not open to a member of our race to hold this doctrine, for within its wide boundaries no dispute between men can be lawfully adjusted outside the courts of law. Instead of vindicating his honor, the English-speaking man who violated the law by seeking redress by personal violence would dishonor himself. Under our law, no wrong against man can be committed that justifies the crime of private vengeance after its commission.

The man of our race who holds that his country would be dishonored by agreeing to unrestricted arbitration forgets that according to this standard he is personally dishonored by doing that very thing. Individually he has become civilized, nationally he remains barbaric, refusing peaceful settlement and insisting upon national revenge—all for injured honor.

Which of us would not rejoice to have Britain and America share with Denmark and Holland, Chili and Argentina, the "dishonor" they have recently incurred, and esteem it a proud possession?

Nations are only aggregates of the individual. The parallel between war and the duel is complete; and as society within our race already relies upon courts of justice to protect its members from all wrongs, so shall the nations finally rely upon international courts.

Objection has been made that unreasonable, dishonoring, or baseless claims might be made under arbitration. That any member of the family of nations would present a claim wholly without basis, or that the court would not decide against it if made, is a danger purely hypothetical. The agreement between nations when made will undoubtedly be framed in accordance with the ideas of Grotius, and the independence and equality of all members and their existing territories recognized. These could not be assailed.

Three incidents have occurred since the court was organized which have caused much pain to the friends of peace throughout the world.

America refused the offer of the Filipinos to adjust their quarrel by arbitration. Britain refused the offer of the Transvaal Republic to arbitrate, although three of the court proposed by the republic were to be British judges, and the other two judges of Holland—the most remarkable offer ever made, highly creditable to the maker and a great tribute to British judges. Neither Russia nor Japan suggested submission to The Hague. Since the Hague court is the result of the Russian Emperor's initiative, this caused equal surprise and pain. The explanation has been suggested that peaceful conferences were being held when Japan attacked at Port Arthur without notice, rendering arbitration impossible.

We must recognize these discouraging incidents, but we have the consolation left us of believing that, had either of the three nations seen, at the beginning, the consequences of ignoring arbitration, as clearly as they did later, they would have accepted arbitration and had reason to congratulate themselves upon the award of the court, whatever it was. They will learn by experience. Notwithstanding these regrettable failures to refer disputes to the Hague court as peaceful umpire, we have abundant reason for satisfaction in the number of instances

in which the court's award has already brought peace without the sacrifice of one human life—the victories which bring no tears.

Signs of action in favor of universal peace abound. Among these may be mentioned that the Inter-Parliamentary Union assembled at St. Louis in 1904 requested the governments of the world to send representatives to an international conference to consider: *First*, the questions for the consideration of which the Conference at the Hague expressed a wish that a future Conference be called. *Second*, the negotiation of arbitration treaties between the nations represented. *Third*, the advisability of establishing an international congress to be convened periodically for the discussion of international questions.

President Roosevelt invited the nations to call the Conference, but has recently deferred to the Emperor of Russia as the proper party to call the nations together again.

Should the proposed periodic congress be established, we shall have the germ of the council of nations, which is coming to keep the peace of the world, judging between nations, as the Supreme Court of the United States judges to-day between states embracing an area larger than Europe. It will be no novelty, but merely an extension of an agency already proved upon a smaller scale. As we dwell upon the rapid strides toward peace which man is making, the thought arises that there may be those now present who will live to see this world-council established, through which is sure to come in the course of time the banishment of man-slaying among civilized nations.

I hope my hearers will follow closely the proceedings of the Hague Conference, for upon its ever-extending sway largely depends the coming of the reign of peace. Its next meeting will be important, perhaps epoch-making. Its creation and speedy success prepare us for surprisingly rapid progress. Even the smallest further step taken in any peaceful direction would soon lead to succcessive steps thereafter. The tide has set in at last, and is flowing as never before for the principle of arbitration as against war.

So much for the temple of peace at The Hague. Permit me a few words upon arbitration in general.

The statesmen who first foresaw and proved the benefits of modern arbitration were Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Jay, and Grenville.

As early as 1780 Franklin writes: "We make daily great improvements in Natural, there is one I wish to see in Moral, Philosophy—the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting each other's throats." His wish was realized in the Jay Treaty of 1794, from which modern arbitration dates. It is noteworthy that this treaty was the child of our race, and that the most important questions which arbitration has settled so far have been those between its two branches.

It may surprise you to learn that from the date of the Jay Treaty, one hundred and eleven years ago, no less than five hundred and seventy-one international disputes have been settled by arbitration. Not in any case has an award been questioned or disregarded, except, I believe, in one case, where the arbiters misunderstood their powers. If in every ten of these differences so quietly adjusted without a wound there lurked one war, it follows that peaceful settlement has prevented fifty-seven wars—one every two years. More than this, had the fifty-seven wars, assumed as prevented by arbitration, developed, they would have sown the seeds of many future wars, for there is no such prolific mother of wars as war itself. Hate breeds hate, quarrel breeds quarrels, war breeds war—a hateful progeny. It is the poorest of all remedies. It poisons as it cures. No truer line was ever penned than this of Milton's, "For what can war but endless war still breed?"

No less than twenty-three international treaties of arbitration have been made within the past two years. The United States made ten with the principal powers, which only failed to be formally executed because the Senate, which shares with our Executive the treaty-making power to the extent that its approval is necessary, thought it advisable to change one word only—"treaty" for "agreement"—which proved

unsatisfactory to the Executive. The vote of the Senate was almost unanimous, showing an overwhelming sentiment for arbitration. The internal difference will no doubt be adjusted.

You will judge from these facts how rapidly arbitration is spreading. Once tried, there is no backward step. It produces peace and leaves no bitterness. The parties to it become better friends than before; war makes them enemies.

Much has been written upon the fearful cost of war in our day, the ever-increasing blood tax of nations, which threatens soon to approach the point of exhaustion in several European lands. To-day France leads with an expenditure of £3 14s. and a debt of £31 3s. 8d. per head. Britain follows with an annual expenditure of £3 8s. 8d. and a debt of £18 10s. 5d. per head. Germany's expenditure is in great contrast—only £1 15s. 4d., not much more than one-third; her debt, £2 12s. 2d. not one-sixth that of Britain. Russia's expenditure is £1 14s. 6d., about the same as the German; her debt £5 9s. 9d. per head.

The military and naval expenditure of Britain is fully half of her total expenditure; that of the other great powers, though less, is rapidly increasing.

All the great national debts, with trifling exceptions—Britain's eight hundred millions, France's twelve hundred millions sterling—are the legacies of war.

This drain, with the economic loss of life added, is forcing itself upon the nations concerned as never before. It threatens soon to become dangerous unless the rapid increase of recent years be stopped; but it is to be feared that not till after the financial catastrophe occurs will nations devote themselves seriously to apply the cure.

The futility of war as a means of producing peace between nations has often been dwelt upon. It is really the most futile of all remedies, because it embitters contestants and sows the seeds of future struggles. Generations are sometimes required to eradicate the hostility engendered by one conflict. War sows dragons' teeth, and seldom gives to either party what it fought for. When it does, the spoil generally proves Dead Sea fruit. The terrible war just concluded is another

case in point. Neither contestant obtained what he fought for, the reputed victor being most of all disappointed at last with the terms of peace. Had Japan, a very poor country, known that the result would be a debt of two hundred millions sterling loading her down, or had Russia known the result, differences would have been peacefully arbitrated. Such considerations find no place, however, in the fiery furnace of popular clamor; as little do those of cost or loss of life. Only if the moral wrong, the sin in itself, of man-slaying is brought home to the conscience of the masses may we hope speedily to banish war. There will, we fear, always be demagogues in our day to inflame their brutal passions and urge men to fight, as a point of honor and patriotism, scouting arbitration as a cowardly refuge. All thoughts of cost or loss of human life vanish when the brute in man, thus aroused, gains sway.

It is the crime of destroying human life by war and the duty to offer or accept peaceful arbitration as a substitute which need to be established, and which, as we think, those of the church, the universities, and of the professions are called upon to strongly emphasize.

If the principal European nations were not free through conscription from the problem which now disturbs the military authorities of Britain, the lack of sufficient numbers willing to enter the man-slaying profession, we should soon hear the demand formulated for a league of peace among the nations. The subject of war can never be studied without recalling this simplest of all modes for its abolition. Five nations co-operated in quelling the recent Chinese disorders and rescuing their representatives in Pekin. It is perfectly clear that these five nations could banish war. Suppose even three of them formed a league of peace—inviting all other nations to join—and agreed that since war in any part of the civilized world affects all nations, and often seriously, no nation shall go to war, but shall refer international disputes to the Hague Conference or other arbitral body for peaceful settlement, the league agreeing to declare non-intercourse with any nation refusing compliance. Imagine a nation cut off to-day from the world. The league also might reserve to itself the right,

where non-intercourse is likely to fail or has failed to prevent war, to use the necessary force to maintain peace, each member of the league agreeing to provide the needed forces, or money in lieu thereof, in proportion to her population or wealth. Being experimental and upon trial, it might be deemed advisable, if necessary, at first to agree that any member could withdraw after giving five years' notice, and that the league should dissolve five years after a majority vote of all the members. Further provisions, and perhaps some adaptations, would be found requisite, but the main idea is here.

The Emperor of Russia called the Hague Conference, which gave us an international tribunal. Were King Edward or the Emperor of Germany or the President of France, acting for their governments, to invite the nations to send representatives to consider the wisdom of forming such a league, the invitation would no doubt be responded to and probably prove successful.

The number that would gladly join such a league would be great, for the smaller nations would welcome the opportunity.

The relations between Britain, France, and the United States to-day are so close, their aims so similar, their territories and fields of operation so clearly defined and so different, that these powers might properly unite in inviting other nations to consider the question of such a league as has been sketched. It is a subject well worthy the attention of their rulers, for of all the modes of hastening the end of war this appears the easiest and the best. We have no reason to doubt that arbitration in its present optional form will continue its rapid progress, and that it in itself contains the elements required finally to lead us to peace, for it conquers wherever it is tried; but it is none the less gratifying to know that there is in reserve a drastic mode of enforcement, if needed, which would promptly banish war.

Notwithstanding all the cheering signs of the growth of arbitration, we should delude ourselves if we assumed that war is immediately to cease, for it is scarcely to be hoped that the future has not to witness more than one great holocaust

of men to be offered up before the reign of peace blesses the earth. The scoria from the smouldering mass of the fiery past, the seeds that great wars have sown, may be expected to burst out at intervals more and more remote, until the poison of the past is exhausted. That there is to be perfect unbroken peace in our progress to this end we are not so unduly sanguine as to imagine. We are prepared for more than one outbreak of madness and folly in the future as in the past; but that peace is to come at last, and that sooner, much sooner, than the majority of my hearers can probably credit, I for one entertain not one particle of doubt.

We sometimes hear, in defence of war, that it develops the manly virtue of courage. This means only physical courage, which some animals and the lower order of savage men possess in the highest degree. According to this idea, the more man resembles the bulldog the higher he is developed as man. The Zulus, armed with spears, rush upon repeating rifles, not because unduly endowed with true courage, but because they lack common sense. One session or less at St. Andrew's University would cure them of their folly. In our scientific day, beyond any that has preceded, discretion is by far the better part of valor. Officers and men, brave to a fault, expose themselves needlessly and die for the country they would have better served by sheltering themselves and living for. Physical courage is far too common to be specially extolled. Japanese, Russian and Turk, Zulu and Achenese are all famous for it. It is often allied with moral cowardice. Hotspur is an ideal physical-courage hero when he exclaims—

> "By heaven, methinks it were an easy leap,
> To pluck bright honor from the pale-faced moon,
> Or dive into the bottom of the deep,
> Where fathom line could never touch the ground,
> And pluck up drowned honor by the locks;
> So that he that doth redeem her thence might wear
> Without corrival all her dignities."

Vain peacock, unless he could reap the glory and strut bespangled with glittering decorations, he cared not to achieve. All for himself, nothing for the cause, nothing for his country.

Achilles, sulking in his tent, incensed upon the question of loot and praying the gods to defeat his own countrymen, is another example of a physically courageous military hero. Fortunately our modern military men are generally of a different type. It is not the individual who conforms to the standard of his age, but the bad standard of the age that is to be condemned. Men are to be judged only by the standard of their time, and though our standard of to-day may be low indeed, the men conforming to it are not to be decried.

If you would be lifted up and inspired by worshipping at the shrine of the much nobler and rarer virtue, moral courage, stand before the Martyrs' Monument yonder. The martyrs cared nothing for earthly glory and honor or reward; their duty was to stand for a noble cause, and for that, not for their own selfish exaltation, they marched through fire and fagot to death unflinchingly, chanting as they marched.

There is one very encouraging indication of progress within our race, as showing, it is to be hoped, the influence of education upon the masses in evolving clearer ideas of responsibility for their actions. The attention of Parliament was recently called to the difficulty of obtaining recruits for the army. The shortage of officers in the auxiliary forces (volunteers and militia) is no less than twenty-five per cent.—one-fourth of the whole. The militia has 32,000 men less than before. The regular army lacks 242 officers, and the British army for India is short 12,000 British recruits. The Government pronounces this "the most serious problem which confronts the military authorities." Some of the highest military authorities see the final remedy only in conscription. I rejoice to inform you that your kin beyond sea in America have on hand the very same problem for their navy. Their army, being so small, is not yet affected. All their warships cannot be manned—3,500 men are lacking. From this shortage of recruits we are justified in concluding that there is no longer a general desire in our race to enter the services. This is specially significant, as we are informed that increase of pay would not greatly increase recruiting, as recruits are obtained chiefly from a certain class. We hear of a like trouble in

another profession, a scarcity of young, educated, conscientious men desirous of entering the ministry, thought to be owing to the theological tenets to which they are required to subscribe. Both branches of the church in Scotland have accordingly endeavored to meet this problem by substituting less objectionable terms.

Perhaps from the public library young men have taken Carlyle and read how he describes the artisans of Britain and France: "Thirty stand fronting thirty, each with a gun in his hand. Straightway the word 'fire' is given, and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcases, which it must bury and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart, were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! Their governors had fallen out, and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot."

Those who decline the advances of the decorated recruiting officer may have stumbled upon Professor MacMichael's address to the Peace Congress at Edinburgh, 1853, when he said: "The military profession is inconsistent with Christianity. The higher the rank and the greater the intellect, the more desperate the criminality. Here is a person upon whom God has conferred the rare gift of mathematical genius. If properly directed, what an abundant source of benefit to mankind! It might be employed in the construction of railways, by which the most distant parts of the world are brought into communication with each other. It might be employed in flashing the trembling lightning across the wires, making them the medium of intercourse between loving hearts thousands of miles apart; in increasing the wonderful powers of the steam engine, relieving man from his exhausting toils; in application to the printing press, sending light and knowledge to the farthest extremities of the earth. It might be employed in draining marshes, in supplying our towns and

cities with water, and in adding to the health and happiness of men. It might lay down rules derived from the starry heavens, by which the mariner is guided through the wild wastes of waters in the darkest night. How noble is science when thus directed, but in the same proportion how debasing does it become when directed to human destruction! It is as if a chemist were to make use of his knowledge not to cure the diseases of which humanity is suffering, but to poison the springs of existence. The scientific soldier cultivates his endowments for what purpose? That he may determine the precise direction at which these batteries may vomit forth their fire so as to destroy most property and most lives; that he may calculate the precise angles and force with which these shells may be sent up into the air that they may fall upon that particular spot which is thronged with men, and, exploding there, send havoc among them. Great God! am I at liberty to devote my faculties to the infernal work?"

That is a voice from Dunfermline of weighty import. I found it recently and rejoiced that, when a child, I had often seen the man who wrote these words.

Wyclif's opinion may have arrested the young men's attention: "What honor falls to a knight that kills many men? The hangman killeth many more and with a better title. Better were it for men to be butchers of beasts than butchers of their brethren!"

Or John Wesley's wail may have struck deep in the hearts of some fit for recruits: "You may pour out your soul and bemoan the loss of true, genuine love in the earth. Lost indeed! These *Christian* kingdoms that are tearing out each other's bowels, desolating one another with fire and sword! These Christian armies that are sending each other by thousands, by tens of thousands, quick to hell!"

It may be from eminent soldiers that young men have received the most discouraging accounts of the profession. Napoleon declared it "the trade of barbarians." Wellington writes Lord Shaftesbury: "War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war, you would pray God you might never see another." General Grant, offered a military

review by the Duke of Cambridge, declined, saying he never wished to look upon a regiment of soldiers again. General Sherman writes he was "tired and sick of the war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot, nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell."

Perhaps some have pondered over Sir John Sinclair's opinion that "the profession of a soldier is a damnable profession."

The professional soldier is primarily required for purposes of aggression, it being clear that if there were none to attack, none to defend would be needed. The volunteer, who arms only to be better able to defend his home and country, occupies a very different position from the recruit who enlists unconditionally as a profession and binds himself to go forth and slay his fellows as directed. The defence of home and country may possibly become necessary, although no man living in Britain or America has ever seen invasion or is at all likely to see it. Still, the elements of patriotism and duty enter here. That it is every man's duty to defend home and country goes without saying. *We should never forget, however, that which makes it a holy duty to defend one's home and country also makes it a holy duty not to invade the country and home of others*, a truth which has not hitherto been kept in mind. The more's the pity, for in our time it is one incumbent upon the thoughtful, peace-loving man to remember. The professional career is an affair of hire and salary. No duty calls any man to adopt the naval or military profession and engage to go forth and kill other men when and where ordered, without reference to the right or wrong of the quarrel. It is a serious engagement involving, as we lookers-on see it, a complete surrender of the power most precious to man—the right of private judgment and appeal to conscience. Jay, the father of the first treaty between Britain and America, has not failed to point out that "our country, right or wrong, is rebellion against God and treason to the cause of civil and religious liberty, of justice and humanity."

Just in proportion as man becomes truly intelligent, we must expect him to realize more and more that he himself alone is responsible for his selection of an occupation, and that neither pope, priest, nor king can relieve him from this responsibility.

It was all very well for the untaught, illiterate hind, pressed into King Henry's service, to argue: "Now, if these men do not die well, it will be a black matter for the King that led them to it, whom to disobey were against all proportion of subjection." The schoolmaster has been abroad since then. The divine right of kings has gone. The mass of English-speaking men now make and unmake their kings, scout infallibility of power of pope or priest, and in extreme cases sometimes venture to argue a point even with their own minister. The "Judge within" begins to rule. Whether a young man decides to devote his powers to making of himself an efficient instrument for injuring or destroying, or for saving and serving his fellows, rests with himself to decide after serious consideration.

To meet the scarcity of officers, the Government stated that it was considering the policy of looking to the universities for the needed supply, and that steps might be taken to encourage the study of war with a view to enlistment; but if university students are so far advanced ethically as to decline pledging themselves to preach "creeds outworn"—rightfully most careful to heed the "Judge within," their own conscience—universities will probably be found poor recruiting ground for men required to pledge themselves to go forth and slay their fellow-men at another's bidding. The day of humiliation will have come upon universities when their graduates, upon whom have been spent years of careful education in all that is highest and best, find themselves at the end good for nothing better than "food for powder." I think I hear the response of the son of St. Andrew's to the recruiting officer, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?"

From one point of view, the scarcity of officers and recruits in Britain and America, where men are free to choose, and the refusal of university students to compromise themselves by

pledges upon entering the ministry, are most cheering, evincing as they do a keener sense of personal responsibility, a stronger appeal to conscience—the "Judge within"—more tender and sympathetic natures, a higher standard of human action, and altogether a higher type of man.

If war requires a surrender of all these by its recruits, much better we should face the alternative and let Britain and America depend upon the patriotism of citizens to defend their countries if attacked, in which duty I for one strongly believe they will never be found inefficient. Colonel Henderson, in his "Science of War," states "that the American Volunteers were superior to the conscript levies of Europe—that the morale of conscript armies has always been their weakest point. The morale of the volunteer is of a higher type." This stands to reason.

Should Britain ever be invaded, the whole male population able to march would volunteer, and from many parts of the world thousands would rush to the defence of the old home. Those who invade the land of Shakespeare and Burns will find they have to face forces they never reckoned upon. The hearts and consciences of all would be in the work; and "Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just."

Students of St. Andrew's, my effort has been to give you a correct idea of the movement now stirring the world for the abolition of war, and what it has already accomplished. It never was so widespread or so vigorous, nor at any stage of the campaign have its triumphs been so numerous and important as those of the last few years, beginning with the Hague Conference, which in itself marks an epoch. The foundation stone of the structure to come was then laid. The absolute surrender by four nations of all future differences to arbitration, and Norway and Sweden's agreement, mark another stage. Thus the civilized world at last moves steadily to the reign of peace through arbitration.

The question has no doubt arisen in your minds, what is your duty and how can you best coöperate in this holy work and hasten the end of war? I advise you to adopt Washington's words as your own: "My first wish is to see this plague

of mankind, war, banished from the earth." Leagues of peace might be formed over the world with these words as their motto and basis of action. How are we to realize this pious wish of Washington's? may be asked. Here is the answer. Whenever an international dispute arises, no matter what party is in power, demand at once that your Government offer to refer it to arbitration, and if necessary break with your party. Peace is above party. Should the adversary have forestalled your Government in offering arbitration, which for the sake of our race I trust will never occur, then insist upon its acceptance and listen to nothing until it is accepted. Drop all other public questions, concentrate your efforts upon the one question which carries in its bosom the issue of peace or of war. Lay aside your politics until this war issue is settled. This is the time to be effective. And what should the ministers of the churches be doing? Very different from what they have done in the past. They should cease to take shelter from the storm, hiding themselves in the recital of the usual formulas pertaining to a future life in which men in this life have no duties, when the nation is stirred upon one supreme moral issue, and its Government, asserting the right to sit in judgment upon its own cause, is on the brink of committing the nation to unholy war—for unholy it must be if peaceful settlement offered by an adversary be refused. Refusal to arbitrate makes war, even for a good cause, unholy; an offer to arbitrate lends dignity and importance to a poor one. Should all efforts fail, and your country, rejecting the appeal to judicial arbitration, plunge into war, your duty does not end. Calmly resolute in adherence to your convictions, stating them when called upon, though never violently intruding them, you await the result, which cannot fail to prove that those who stood for peaceful arbitration chose the right path and have been wise counsellors of their country. It is a melancholy fact that nations looking back have usually to confess that their wars have been blunders, which means they have been crimes.

And the women of the land, and the women students of St. Andrew's—what shall they do? Not wait as usual until war has begun, and then, their sympathies aroused, organize

innumerable societies for making and sending necessaries and even luxuries to the front, or join Red Cross societies and go themselves to the field, nursing the wounded that these may the sooner be able to return to the ranks to wound others or be again wounded, or to kill or be killed. The tender chords of sympathy for the injured, which grace women, and are so easily stirred, are always to be cherished; but it may be suggested that were their united voices raised in stern opposition to war before it was declared, urging the offer of arbitration, or in earnest remonstrance against refusing it, one day of effort would then prove more effective than months of it after war has begun.

It is certain that if the good people of all parties and creeds, sinking for the time other political questions whenever the issue of war arises, were to demand arbitration, no government dare refuse. They have it in their power in every emergency to save their country from war and ensure unbroken peace.

If in every constituency there were organized an arbitration league, consisting of members who agree that arbitration of international disputes must be offered, or accepted by the government if offered by the adversary, pledging themselves to vote in support of, or in opposition to, political parties according to their action upon this question, it would be surprising how soon both parties would accept arbitration as a policy. I know of no work that would prove more fruitful for your country and for the world than this. It is by concentrating upon one issue that great causes are won.

In this holy work of insisting upon arbitration, surely we may expect the men and women of St. Andrew's, of all universities and other educational institutions, of all the churches and of all the professions to unite and take a prominent part. I quoted the words of Washington at the beginning of this appeal. Let me close by quoting the words of Lincoln. When a young man, employed upon a trading boat, he made a voyage of some weeks' duration upon the Mississippi. He visited a slave market, where men, women, and children were not slaughtered, as formerly in war, but were separated and sold from the auction block. His companion tells that after stand-

ing for some time Lincoln turned and walked silently away. Lifting his clenched hand, his first words were, "If ever I get a chance, I shall hit this accursed thing hard." Many years passed, during which he never failed to stand forth as the bitter foe of slavery and the champion of the slave. This was for him the paramount issue. He was true to his resolve throughout life, and in the course of events his time came at last. This poor, young, toiling boatman became President of the United States, and was privileged with a stroke of his pen to emancipate the slaves last remaining in the civilized world, four millions in number. He kept the faith, and gave the lesson for all of us in our day, who have still with us war in all its enormity, many of us more or less responsible for it, because we have not hitherto placed it above all other evils and concentrated our efforts sufficiently upon its extinction. Let us resolve like Lincoln, and select man-slaying as our foe, as he did man-selling. Let us, as he did, subordinate all other public questions to the one overshadowing question, and, as he did, stand forth upon all suitable occasions to champion the cause. Let us, like him, keep the faith, and as his time came, so to us our time will come, and, as it does, let us hit accursed war hard until we drive it from the civilized world, as he did slavery.

XXXIII

HISTORY

"VALUE OF HISTORY IN THE FORMATION OF CHARACTER"

BY

CAROLINE HAZARD

PRESIDENT OF WELLESLEY COLLEGE

IN view of the appeal to history made in support of their views by both President Jordan and Mr. Carnegie, the following address by Miss Hazard acquires special emphasis. Caroline Hazard, M.A., Litt.D., is one of the only two women holding the rank of president of a great college. Vassar, Smith, and Barnard have each of them male rulers. Hence President Hazard may well speak with authority as representing woman in the realms of higher education, and the value of a knowledge of history assumes under her urgency a peculiar force.

How dearly we all love a story! From the time a child can listen at all he rejoices in some simple tale. Over and over the same thing is demanded, with no variation allowed to the narrator; it must be just the same day after day, or something is lacking to the childish mind. And what is history but the tale of the world? The story of our race, "Geschichte" the Germans call it frankly, the story, the tale which includes all tales. It is strange that the word story has a double significance. It may be a true or a false story. Something has grown into the word of the diverse personalities of the tellers of tales. The story is told in part only by each narrator; one may contradict the other; one may present a false picture, a distorted report, and another the unvarnished truth. It is no wonder that many writers of history fell into disrepute, that fables and stories were supposed to constitute the whole of history. The tale

depends so much upon the teller. Is he fair? Is he clear in his perceptions? Is he unbiassed in his judgments, having no theory to maintain, simply zealous for the truth? These are moral questions we ask, these are the questions which are more important to the value of historical work than any learning. "It was well noted by that worthy gentleman Sir Philip Sydney," says Raleigh, "that historians do borrow of poets, not only much of their ornament but somewhat of their substance."[1] And Lord Bacon defines the office of the historian. "It is," he says, "to represent the events themselves together with the counsels, and to leave the observations and conclusions thereupon to the liberty and faculty of every man's judgment."[2] Bacon thus throws the moral responsibility directly upon the readers, not the writers, of history.

But the old reproach, that historians wrote entirely from their own point of view, is rapidly passing away. One may be recommended to read Macaulay more for the style than for the history. But the method pursued in Guizot's "History of Civilization" has obtained a larger and larger following, and the modern historian, basing his work on actual documents and certified records, while he makes perhaps less brilliant reading, certainly gives a more unbiassed version of facts. More and more the science of history is developing, as people go to the sources and foundations rather than rely on tradition and picturesque statement. Great tendencies are coming to be looked for, more than isolated facts. History is no longer a list of names and an array of dates, but a series of living principles, a moral tendency running through events which are strung upon one main string like the beads on a rosary. More and more our historians are becoming profound moralists. This, indeed, is almost inevitable, for any deeper search into the facts of history is an inquiry into the meaning of things. The facts spring from the inner necessity of the time of their being, and the philosophical inquirer must look deeper than the surface appearance.

We have lately lost a very distinguished example of the teacher not only of history but of morals, and of the vital con-

[1] Raleigh, *The History of the World.*
[2] Bacon, *Advancement of Learning.*

nection existing between the two. Eminent as were Mr. John Fiske's qualifications as a historian—painstaking and accurate in his research, brilliant and lucid in his presentation—it was yet his profound moral convictions which illuminated his work and gave it its great value. What a splendid monument he has left—beginning with the "Discovery of America," tracing the influence of "Old Virginia" and her neighbors, and the "Beginnings of New England," through the "American Revolution" and the "Critical Period of American History," taking in as a side-light the "Dutch Contribution to the Development of America," and finally ending with the "Growth of the Mississippi"—what a great and continuous work he has left! The very enumeration of the titles of his books shows the grasp that he had on the subject. But greater even than these are some of the books he wrote showing his profound appreciation of the destiny of man. It was this "Destiny of Man," viewed in the light of his origin, which enabled him to set forth these great world movements. It was his profound conviction of the worth of man's life which gave the work of man's life its supreme value in his eyes. Through Nature to God was his constant theme. His important philosophical books are brief, and the bulk of his philosophical writings not so great as his historical work, but its influence upon his day and generation has been most profound.

I was in England at the time of his death, and was much interested to see the English comments. The great dailies, of course, had some adequate idea of his work, at least as far as the enumeration of the titles of his books. But one of the most appreciative of the notices was in a nonconformist weekly of large and influential circulation in Great Britain. This spoke of his "Destiny of Man" and of his work as a devout Darwinist with the greatest respect, dwelling upon him as a profound philosopher, and ending with some such sentence as this: "He is said to have written historical books, but we have not seen them." It made one smile to think what fame is in another country, because to us certainly the bulk of John Fiske's work is his historical work rather than his philosophical.

But the point I want to make is that the true historian must

be a philosopher, and, if a philosopher, then an inquirer into moral tendencies, into the great drift and trend of national life. This principle must run through all the work of any genuine historian. We are a little in danger in this country of exalting our own history, which is after all local, of forgetting that we are part of the whole. Of course it is necessary to teach our young people American history, and the great events which have led to our being what we are. But we are only one link in the chain of events. We have only advanced freedom and liberty to its highest degree along the line which was prepared for us as early as the Reformation. To teach a child anything like the proper place of America in the history of the world seems to me one of the great tasks which our schools should try to fulfil. Of course this cannot be done quickly. The idea of continuity, however, is an idea which can be given at the very beginning of any historical study. We are too apt to take up the study of history in mosaic fashion, here a bit and there a bit, quite carefully worked over and prepared, but without any idea of how it fits together. The study of Roman history has become one of the requirements, lately, for entrance examinations, and it seems to me a most valuable addition to college-entrance requirements. Roman law, after all, is the foundation of all our jurisprudence, and though the real historian may say that in choosing Rome as a starting-point we are making an arbitrary choice, and that we should go back into the Far East and into the dim recesses of time, yet, after all, the Roman civilization is the first civilization of which we can have much definite knowledge, and, therefore, is a convenient and a safe starting-point for all subsequent historical work.

This is not the time to consider the relations of national character to national history. The history has grown out of the development of character, and character, conversely, has been moulded by the history of the nation. We think of Switzerland as a synonym for freedom, and the Swiss have been nurtured on the recital of the deeds of their forefathers. The Scottish people, too, with their devotion of loyalty, their keenness and shrewdness learned in many a border warfare and many a fight for a losing cause, are an example of what the history of their

nation has made them. Who that hears "Bonnie Charlie" sung as it can be sung in Scotland, but is touched by that longing for the unattainable which is the blessing and the despair of the idealist?

> Will you no' come back again?
> Better lo'ed ye canna be,
> Will ye no' come back again?

The whole episode is summed up in a few verses of a song, perhaps the most potent result of that ill-starred attempt. For in this all the highest emotions of a patriot find play. It was the literal Prince Charlie to whom the people looked as their best good; it is now all devotion and loyalty to all good things that speaks in the touching refrain of a song universally beloved.

But the special theme for this evening is the "Relation of the Study of History to the Formation of Character," and it seems to me, in a country such as our own, with a population made up of diverse elements, where the force of tradition is of necessity limited—where, indeed, in many parts of the country we are making traditions, so far as civilization is concerned—that the study of history as a contribution to the formation of a sound and useful character is of the utmost importance. We are in danger of exalting the new unduly. There are countries bound by custom, where "as it was, is now, and ever shall be" is the height of man's ambition. Of Infinite Perfection alone can this be said, and in our haste for improvement we rush to the other extreme, often thinking that because a thing is new it must be better than what went before. Here historical study comes in as a corrective. Often we find the thing that we thought new only an old project under a slightly different aspect. As an instance of what I mean, I mention a paper of 1780, which in its own neighborhood had some effect in the agitation for the establishment of the gold standard in 1893 and 1894. All through the closing years of the eighteenth century Rhode Island was plunged in financial difficulties by the successive issues of paper money which it had no means of redeeming. The declaration to which I refer records on oath that a certain Colonel Segar

made a tender of $2,100 to Mr. William Knowles, of South Kingstown, to discharge two bonds and a note, but that "Knowles refused to take the same, saying that he would not take such trash as that was, but if said Samuel Segar would pay him in the same sort of money the said Segar had of said Knowles, he would take it." With this declaration the paper money tendered in payment was found, the whole making an impressive lesson in the evils of an inflated currency. One is apt to exclaim with Solomon that there is no new thing under the sun, in spite of our eager quest, and to believe that the past, if duly searched, could always furnish analogies and precedents for the present. We must know the past as a guide to the future, for not only does the study of history give a firm foundation for growth, but it furnishes actual instances, full of helpful suggestion.

There is no virtue we need to cultivate more than that of patriotism. America is a fair new world, and she welcomes many sons. What does she do with them? We are learning to our bitter grief it is not enough to receive them, to give them free air to breathe; they must be trained. The seeds of oppression and wrong sown in Poland and Russia may bear their bitter fruit fostered by our genial sun. The whole nation has been stirred to its very heart to see that this is possible. Given light and air, we had fondly supposed that anarchy and revenge would hide their heads and quickly die. And they will; the forces of good are sure to win in the end; and the costly sacrifice which has been laid on the altar of freedom will hasten that end. But have we no responsibility? Should not the schools redouble their efforts? Should not the teachers of history especially draw lessons from the lives of patriots and leaders of the people which shall inspire a love of country, a pride in our native land, and a cheerful acquiescence in her laws? We are led by example rather than precept; and hero-worship is a safe channel for the youthful imagination. Cannot our best men be made to live again before the minds of school children to stimulate and incite them to the practice of their virtues?

You remember Browning's account of the chairs and tables

his father piled together for the siege of Troy, set him atop for Priam,

> . . . called our cat
> Helen, enticed away from home he said
> By wicked Paris, who crouched somewhere close
> Under the footstool, being cowardly,
> But whom—since she was worth the pains, poor puss—
> Towzer and Tray, our dogs, the Atreidai, sought,
> By taking Troy to get possession of.
>
> This taught me who was who and what was what.
> So far I rightly understood the case
> At five years old; a huge delight it proved
> And still proves, thanks to that instructor sage,
> My father, who knew better than turn straight
> Learning's full flare on weak-eyed ignorance.

This, indeed, is the ideal method, to capture the young imagination, to give it noble and fine pictures to dwell upon, to lead the child's mind to the perception of truth and beauty. With the whole story of the world to choose from, there can hardly be any lack of material. A wise teacher must select and present to his scholars what arouses his own enthusiasm. One fine spirit can literally inspire many others.

And if patriotism can be inculcated by a study of history, no less so can personal honor. Who can say how great an effect the romances of Sir Walter Scott have had in holding up pure and true characters to admiration, and in exposing the futility as well as the evils of a career of duplicity and deceit? The modern historical novel, with its quicker movement and more terse style, fulfils its object in presenting a living picture of the time no better than the more leisurely tales of the great northern writer. Our own American historians have told their stories without the adventitious aids of romance, and yet have given us fascinating books, full of the deepest interest. The pages of Parkman need no embellishment of fiction to hold the closest attention. Scholarship and beauty of style are both exemplified by Motley, and John Fiske presents us one leader after another in clearly defined and exquisite portraiture. Surely from these storehouses our young people have treasures the value of which they have not fully appreciated; examples of right living and

high thinking which should become part of the mental furniture of each scholar.

But to come to a more particular consideration of the effect of historical study upon character, I should say in the first place that it demands absolute accuracy. Even if historical study is pursued in the old dry-as-dust fashion, this mental habit must be fostered. There are still some people who regard long lists of the kings of England and a string of dates as being the sum of historical study. Partial as this view is, it has an element of truth, for the dates are pegs to hang our hats on—are very necessary for all subsequent and wider study. And learning them is good mental discipline. This accuracy lies at the foundation of character. Truth, exact truth, in so far as it can be learned, becomes the aim of the scholar. The accuracy which historical study teaches is of especial value in such a community as ours, where the ordinary forms of speech run to humorous exaggeration. Who has not seen a child puzzled by some fanciful speech of an older person, not knowing whether to take it seriously or not? Such surprising things are true, one cannot wonder that the youthful imagination will accept the wildest statements. We are as a people careless in our ordinary conversation, loving hyperbole and suggestion. This gives piquancy and flavor to our intercourse with each other, and is delightful as a play of fancy, giving a shining and pleasant surface to society, but there must be a depth of current underneath these sparkling waves of thought, or the shallows become painfully apparent. A sound and accurate basis of fact is the first and foremost contribution which historical study makes to the cultivated man.

To the accuracy which such study teaches, perseverance must be added. All study, no matter how delightful, has its drudgery. We must pursue for the sake of the end in view very often, not for the pleasure of the immediate moment. This is hard to make a child realize. He must simply do the work assigned him obediently, leaving the end to be gained out of sight; an end which his parents and teachers can appreciate, but which he cannot yet see. Accuracy and perseverance must enter into all study, but without them historical study is impossible. These two are

certainly moral qualities most desirable to foster, most essential to the growth of a strong character. And with these two comes the use of the imagination. In childhood the imagination is particularly strong. A little child often has no idea of what we call truth. The external world has not yet become real. Its own thoughts, its own fancies, are quite as real to it. The distinction between "I did" and "I thought" does not yet exist. The external world takes hold slowly. This power of imagination which a child has can be trained and developed, and there are few better ways to do it than by historical reading. Here a basis is given for the play of the imagination. The child is not allowed to dissipate his fancies; there is some solid foundation; his thought, like a falcon, is held in leash and sent after its quarry.

These qualities of accuracy, perseverance, and proper control of the imagination all come into play at a little later period of historical work from that of which I have just been speaking, when a student is able to take up a problem for himself. It seems to me a most valuable thing to have a young student see for himself the sources of history. This can be done in most of our New England towns by an actual visit to the town record office. Dry and musty papers which are so dear to the heart of a historian may seem very prosaic and trivial to the young student; but give him a problem to work out, and let him find the real uses of the papers, and they quickly acquire a charm, and open the recesses of the past to him with an enchanter's wand. In one school I know distinct problems have been set in local history—as to the existence of slavery, for instance, in that particular township; an inquiry as to the methods of apprenticeship, or the export of certain crops could be made, of which records can be obtained in the office of the town clerk. The records that I am most familiar with are in the keeping of a town clerk elected to that office for many years, so that he has a personal pride and delight in the work. Nothing is more interesting to the young student than to be allowed to take down a volume of records of the eighteenth century kept in the fine clerical hand of the period, and under the legal phraseology and cumbersome repetition of names to discover the truth for which he

is seeking. In this particular record office there are deeds of gift from Samuel Sewall to the town, and I never shall forget the delight with which the discovery was finally made of the actual site and the actual conditions under which the meeting-house lot was presented to the town.

In all such study the qualities which I have spoken of, unfailing accuracy never passing beyond the bounds of truth; steady perseverance to pursue the end sought; and then a trained imagination enabling the student from bare facts to reconstruct the past, to form some rational theory as to why the man who made the deed did so, what his motives must have been, and how the final act was accepted by his neighbors; all this involves and implies high capacity, and moral as well as intellectual power.

The traveller in foreign countries notices this pride of locality. What Scotchman will not tell you the story of a border warfare or some midnight raid? How the Rhine teems with legends and tales of barons and knights! How replete is the storied land of Italy with interest and tales that appeal to the imagination! Our own history, so far as it concerns the occupation of America by the Caucasian race, is brief, but it has its heroic episodes, and one of the great missions of the history teacher is to gather from this story. Unfortunately, where there is short continuity of family life, tradition, and legend, the penumbra of historic fact is sadly interrupted. It is this which gives poetry and charm to the life of a people. We, in New England, are far richer in this respect than any of our neighbors, with the possible exception of the Virginians. Here the bond to the old country is strongest; here the very names of our towns recall the counties of England: Gloucester, and Plymouth, and the west country names appear on our barren east shore. By no great stretch of the imagination we find our places in our English homes as well as in our homes of New England, and I would caution our teachers of local history to try to make this connection. Without this we are in danger of regarding ourselves too much from an isolated point of view; we become excrescences on the growth of the world rather than an integral part of it; an island set in the world's current, rather than a contrib-

uting stream. And in magnifying our own history let us not forget the general history of our country. While the Revolution was being fought on the eastern coast, a peaceful revolution was going on in the west, on the slopes of the Pacific, where the olive and the orange and the vine were being planted by pious hands, and a peaceful and mighty revolution in the old order of nature was taking place. When the Pilgrim fathers were landed in the East, already Spanish missionaries had penetrated beyond our present southern border, and were scattering the seeds of Spanish civilization in what was to be our great western country. A little later the French came down from the North, meeting the civilization creeping up the great river, the artery of the new world, so that from many and diverse sources our present civilization has grown. New England was an important factor in this, but it becomes us New Englanders to be modest and recognize the origin of the other streams which have poured their life blood into our present commonwealth.

In addition to the mental training to which the study of history should contribute, there are other great moral lessons which it should teach. First, I would mention that the study of history inculcates the rule of law. Any wise student of history cannot fail to bring out in bold relief the necessity and wisdom of submitting to law, and the inexorability of the law itself. Consequences follow unerringly upon the breaking of any of the great laws. Marie Antoinette was beheaded. This in itself is an isolated fact without special significance to the young student's mind. Let him inquire into the causes of this event; let him understand something of the condition of the French people before the Revolution—of their rights trampled upon, of the arrogant assumption of power by the nobles—and he will see that some such fact as this was the logical outcome of the conditions; that the great law of the sovereignty of the people must assert itself; that it could not be kept under. There have been triumphs of injustice, there have been times of terrible misrule, but the reign of law has been vindicated, the results of anarchy have been overthrown.

And in a country like ours reverence is another virtue which history teaches us, and which we are in especial need of learning.

We are apt to see the humorous side of things too clearly. The typical American hides his feelings under some light and flippant exclamation. We are hardly old enough yet to dare to be as reverent as we truly are. It takes poise and security of one's own position to be absolutely simple, for simplicity, far from being the simple thing that seems, often comes to us through complexity. It is history and historical study which should teach us reverence. For is not reverence at the foundation of all respect? To respect the right of others which lies at the foundation of all true democracy, one must have a reverent spirit, a spirit which can see and revere all that is good and right, though presented in very varying conditions, and with no adventitious aids of outward circumstances. "A man's a man for a' that" lies at the root of free institutions. In respect for the life of men, in reverence for the aims of the spirit of man, history is best qualified to instruct us. It is the life of the great men who have gone before us which is our greatest inspiration. Their life and their character still live in the world. We who have come after can only accept what is good in them with devout thankfulness, and try to imitate their virtues.

And the highest and best of all the teachings of history should be reverence for truth. Truth is so many-sided; she veils her face behind so many veils. But what can be more inspiring than the search for truth? As we see a little further, as we redouble our efforts to find her, do we not receive the highest reward and the highest incentive to our study? The whole of life is so closely woven together that what seems an isolated event is of vital importance and connection with what goes before and what comes after. To see a little farther, to trace some unknown connection, what greater reward can any study offer, what higher satisfaction? As the painter before his landscape sees more and more of beauty, as to his trained eye the shadows become full of living color, and his subject glows with more than the light of day, as exquisite relations and unseen beauties reveal themselves, so with the historical student. The period of his study becomes vital with living interest. Facts group themselves about the central events, side lights are thrown by contemporary documents, truth becomes more lovely and

more alluring as the ultimate foundations recede before the eager search, and hide themselves in the mysterious recesses of the human will. But to gain one little point, to establish one small link in the great chain of the growth of the world, what delight can be keener, what quest more honorable? For "what has been ever shall be," better, larger, more inclusive. Good in bygone days may not be just our good, but its quality cannot change, though we spell it differently. We must be saved because we cling

> "To the same, same self, same love,
> Same God; ay, what was shall be."

It is the passion for truth which is the scholar's passion, and the promise of truth which is the scholar's highest reward. If we look for truth in times that have gone by; if we look for it in the history of our own place and our own local habitation, shall we not reverence it more and more in our own lives? Shall we not appreciate that we too are making history, and that we must make it on the side of righteousness?

Is this too much to expect of the study of history? It should give a background for the whole of life, it should furnish a working theory of the advance of the world. It is not a fixed science; constant contributions are made to it by research and by philosophy. New schools are constantly arising among its votaries, but its basis is on fact, and its growth is the growth of the life of man. It teaches us great lessons, lessons at the foundation of right thinking and right living, the immutability of law, reverence, and the love of truth. These are lessons worth the learning, lessons which carry their reward with them in the promise of future growth and achievement. These are lessons woven into the very texture of freedom, without which there can be no stability. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

XXXIV

THE POWER OF RELIGION

"RELIGION STILL THE KEY TO HISTORY"

BY

SIMEON EBEN BALDWIN

FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION; PROFESSOR OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, YALE UNIVERSITY

THE thought of peace is ever closely associated in our minds with the thought of religion. If peace and good will to man are ever really to rule the earth, it must be largely by the force of religion, that is, by faith and aspiration, that the mighty triumph shall be accomplished. To many men, looking back on the days of an imperious, iron-clad church, summoning the force of armies and inquisitions to impose her will upon emperors and nations, the power of religion has seemed to be grown faint. It has even become common to cry out against our age as one of doubt and little faith. Yet if we will read beneath the surface, if we will accept here the guidance of a specialist in the field of both law and history, we shall learn of other views, of subtler, deeper truths as to what religion does and yet shall do in moulding life.

Professor Baldwin is not only the late retiring President of the American Historical Association, before whose most recent annual meeting this address was delivered. He is also Professor of Constitutional Law at Yale University, and a Judge of the Supreme Court of Connecticut. Such a man is to be led astray neither by sentiment nor by superficial analysis; and when he declares the power and influence of religion to be of such

weight as he here asserts, those of us who have dismissed the subject as an obsolete or dying one must revise our judgments—or defend them against the Judge.

THERE are three men in the world whose daily doings and sayings especially interest it—the Emperor William, President Roosevelt, and the Pope of Rome. Two command public attention by the union of great official powers with strong native faculties of mind and will. The third commands it almost purely from his official character. He governs no territory, although his authority is daily felt in the remotest quarters of the globe, and he holds a court to which great nations send ambassadors. In the sphere where he does bear rule, he has evinced no faculty of individual initiative. He has no force of speech, no power of the pen. The son of a simple peasant, his greatness consists in his headship of a venerable and world-wide church, and in his thus standing, more than any other man, as the representative of a great religion.

Lamprecht tells us that history is "an sich nichts als angewandte Psychologie." To this extent certainly the epigram rings true that history can never neglect to take into account whatever psychological forces move peoples or actuate leaders of peoples. Such a force has always been found, is still found, in religion. It is one of those—vague, impulsive, constant in play, inconstant in intensity—which deny to the historical student the power of scientific prediction.

Ours is an age of more reverence for human reason and less reverence for human authority. But as reverence for human authority becomes less, a conviction deepens that men are subject to a power greater than themselves. We may call it Nature, or call it God. What we know is that it speaks by laws—invariable laws. What we feel is that it is a thing of mystery—too great to be measured from earth; too far from man, near though it be at every step, to be so much as seen in all its outline by his philosophy.

The relation of history to religion has been greatly changed during the last two centuries. What we call modern history,

and distant times may deem to be that of the Middle Ages, had its real beginning when modern government arose, and that was when the peoples of France and the United States, as they gathered in the fruits of their revolutions, pronounced that absolute religious liberty was one. Civil liberty and popular government were no new things in the world. A state without a church was. Guizot has said that Democracy was introduced into Europe by a foreign missionary named Paul. If this be so, it was a democracy whose motive and sphere were religious. Political democracy dissevered from religion was to come seventeen centuries later.

It was to take from religion its legal authority, but only to strengthen its moral power. Until the "ideas of 1789" took formal shape, history had been the record of what the few did with the help of the many. It has since been the record of what the many do, with the help of the few. It may well be that at some time the leaders—the few who are in authority in any nation—may be careless of religion. The many—or, at the least, the whole people—never will be. If a majority should be indifferentists or irreligious, the minority will be all the more devoted to the cause to which they attribute a sacred character.

Religion offers in statecraft a means of resting policy upon principle. It is, as Talleyrand has said, only when rested upon principle that a policy can endure.[1] The principles sanctioned by the religion of the time are incontestable. Later times may discard them. But to each generation of any people the principles instilled by ministers of religion under the sanction of the church will permeate society and become a part of its being—of what in the truest sense is its political constitution.

I use religion to signify something real, and not less real because to one set of men it is one thing, to another set another thing. It does not seem to me that Renan was right when he said that "Les religions, comme les philosophies, sont toutes vaines; mais la religion, pas plus que la philosophie, n'est

[1] *Memoirs*, Putnam's edition, II. 124.

vaine."[1] No religion is wholly vain. Each is true to its disciples, and in its truth to them inspires their lives. History has to do with all religions, because it has to do with all men.

Every great religion has come at the beginning with a resistless power. It comes as the expression by some clear-sighted, high-strung leader of men of what has long lain confusedly in the minds of many of his fellow countrymen, now first really disclosed to them and clothed with a light and power that is wholly new. There is a truth in it, or it would not be great; and truth endures.

Such a religion has a beginning, but it will have no end until the national ideas of the peoples to whom it has presented a new conception of life are radically changed. It worked a social revolution when it first appeared, but the shock of it then, however great, was less of a world force than the trembling, far-diffused, which in after years and ages has marked its continued life. It is a permanent addition to the energies of civilization.

As a key to history, religion has changed its form since the overthrow of the ancient order of things that marked the close of the eighteenth century; but its strength remains the same.

Once that strength was largely found in the power of an established church, or of a sentiment of opposition to an established church. Now it is coming more from the force of the principles for which, at bottom, churches stand, in influencing general public opinion.

Once it received large expression in the fine arts, brought to the service of ecclesiasticism. The pyramids, the Greek temple no less than the Gothic cathedral, the paintings of the masters of former days, in Asia as well as Europe, the great music of the past, were all its offspring. To-day these arts turn for the most part elsewhere for their inspiration and ideals.

The artist is tired of the anthropomorphism by which his predecessors degraded the divine. The architect is planning, the decorator is adorning, museums, libraries, lecture halls,

[1] *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, I. xxviii.

statehouses, more than churches. The composer meets every mood. But there is here, too, a line that never can be passed. A school of art may be non-religious. It cannot be irreligious, and endure.

Once religion led to alliances of nations for no other cause than that they shared the same form of it, and wished, perhaps, to secure it a wider spread. Against such connections the Peace of Westphalia, with its rule of *cujus regio, ejus religio*, shut one door, and the futile outcome of the Holy Alliance closed another. In international affairs the distinction between Christian and infidel has passed away as fully as that between Greek and barbarian; but that which is vital to all religions and common to all religions is but the more clearly seen and strongly felt.

History has a place in "the literature of power." It has it only by right of the human motive that controls events and the imagination that can see and paint it.

There was a half-truth in what Sir Edward Burne-Jones once said, that there were but four English historians: Shakespeare, Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray. There is no historian who is not an artist. He must tell his story in a large way. He is concerned with what is in essence part of a long process. Facts, as Macaulay puts it, are the dross of history. Their relations to us are what is to be fined out, and when these are found in religion something great has at once come in to dignify the work.

Herbert Spencer has said that in the fine arts "a work . . . which is full of small contrasts and without any great contrasts sins against the fundamental principles of beauty."[1] The thought may be extended to historical literature. There must be great contrasts to make any particular history effective. But more than this, it is only so far as it presents great contrasts that any history, be it particular or universal, is true. They are its soul. They are the moving cause of the trivial events and common course of things which conceal them from general observation.

[1] *Autobiography*, II. 408.

Such contrasts, in those states of society with which the historian has to deal, enter into each human life. They come from those two things which, as Kant said, fill every man with a certain awe—the starry heavens and the still, small voice of his own conscience. This conscience may be largely a product of human evolution. It means little or nothing to the savage. The starry heavens mean little to him. But he is impressed by the inborn or from birth intrained conviction that there are higher and unseen powers, one or many, from whom something is to be feared or gained. Man enters organized society without losing this conviction. He feels himself bound to something higher and stronger. The bond may easily become a fetter, but on the whole it makes life larger and less selfish.

What is natural to man is inherited from generation to generation. Whatever he has acquired—be it of thought or knowledge—must be taught over again by each generation to the next, if it is to endure. Religion is part of his nature—a spiritual possession which education does not give, except in form, and seldom takes away.

That the religion of every race has, down to recent times, gone far to shape its history, few will dispute. Does its controlling influence on national conditions pass away before a higher civilization and a wider knowledge? May it be a key to the life of a tribe of savages, but only as an incident of immaturity and ignorance? Does the key grow rusty, as time goes on? Or is the religious motive one of the inherent, universal, and eternal forces that must, in all ages, deeply affect, if not vitally control, the doings of men, as massed in nations, in matters of national concern?

Perhaps the answer hangs on what the religious motive is. If it be to secure some personal good, whether here or hereafter, for one's self or one's family, it will be inevitably weakened by advances in civilization. All those advances are toward altruism. Altruism proceeds trom the spirit of self-sacrifice, and that is the highest spring of religion. "Selfish and interested individualism," says John Morley, "has been truly called non-historic. Sacrifice has been the law—sacrifice for

creeds, for churches, for dynasties, for kings, for adored teachers, for native land."[1]

It is this spirit which gives all its nobility to the story of our race. As it brought all Christendom together in the Crusades, so it brought the civilized world together in the Conference of Peace at The Hague in 1899. In each of these great movements it was distinctly associated with religion—blindly in the one, truly in the other. That the ancient distinction between Christian and infidel found no place in the rescript of the Czar, which led to the Hague Conference, was of itself some proof of its essentially religious motive.[2]

Thus far in the history of the earth, the mass of mankind have ever sought to regulate their conduct by their desires.. Civilization has somewhat modified their desires. It has given them new forms, inspired them by new influences, turned

[1] "Democracy and Reaction," *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1905 (vol. 57, p. 547).

[2] At a critical moment in the proceedings of the Hague Conference of 1899, there came into the hands of the president of the American delegation a letter sent out by the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Texas to the clergy of his diocese with a form of prayer to be used in all the churches, asking the blessing of God on the work of the Conference in the interests of peace. The Emperor of Germany had instructed his representatives to oppose the institution of any court of arbitration. Mr. White was at the time preparing a despatch to the German Prime Minister urging him to use his influence to secure a reconsideration of the question. He referred to the letter of the Bishop as an important utterance of a widely prevailing Christian sentiment, which could not be disregarded, and also handed it to the bearer of the despatch, his associate, the late Dr. Holls, to use as he might think best. Dr. Holls showed it to the Chancellor, Prince Hohenlohe, who—a strong religionist—was evidently affected by it. Not long afterward, the German delegation took a position favorable to the treaty of arbitration, and Mr. White refers to the incident as "perhaps an interesting example of an indirect 'answer to prayer.'" *Autobiography of Andrew D. White*, II. 311, 322.

We have his authority also for the statement that religion in a curious way dictated the original call for the Hague Conference. The Czar acted in the matter on the advice of Pobedonostseff. Pobedonostseff desired a reduction of armaments as the only means which he could see to give Russia the means to increase her grants for the benefit of the state church. *Ibid.*, 269–270.

them in new directions, subjected them to certain conventions; but individual desires are still what press forward as the natural motive forces in and of organized society.

Nevertheless, they have seldom for any long period ruled the course of society. There has been a minority of the people, actuated by counterforces of an intensive character and power, sufficient to make it stronger than the majority in so far as to beat down mere desire and replace it by some theory which all recognize as more noble and worthy. Philosophers have led one wing of this minority; religionists the other. And which has proved the stronger force, religion or philosophy? Which appeals to the most minds? Which appeals to the most hearts? To the heart, religion alone. The morals, the ideals of the philosopher, are powerless with the multitude unless touched by the fire of emotion and quickened by that faith in the unseen which turns human things into divine things.

The philosophic thought of Eastern literature is also religious. The effect of this literature on the Western mind has become, during the last half-century, quite considerable. It has reinforced the Emersonian school and given new recognition to reverence for the mysterious in the order of the universe.

Religion, being man's conception of what is fit for a superhuman or divine order of things, must vary in form to correspond with differences in human insight and knowledge. Following the general law for all that lives, formulated by Spencer and Darwin, it everywhere proceeds in its manifestations from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, and must continue in this course. It is not that the ultimate object of search changes. The attitudes and capacities of the observers change. If any particular religion ever overspreads the earth and gains universal acceptance, it will gain it everywhere by taking its color, like the chameleon, from the soil, or perhaps, as to-day with the Christian religion, assuming many colors on the same soil. Only the motive and the general moral product will be cosmic.

Men owe to their mothers their first introduction to the

world of the mind and the spirit. Women are, by their inherent nature, religious beings. Equality of civil rights before the law will never disturb the poise of that nature. It is never satisfied to be ensphered within itself. It seeks to ally itself with something stronger. It responds readily to the mysterious. In a sense it is true that the life of every man turns on what is to be his relation to some woman. In a much deeper sense is it true that the life of every woman turns on what is to be her relation to some man. If happiness of home be denied to a man, he may find, or fancy that he finds, the void filled in the busy world. If it be denied to a woman, she cannot. She feels the void too deep to fill, unless it be by a peace that the world can neither give nor take away. And if happiness of home be given to a woman, she is more apt than man to think it but a gift from some higher power.

These sentiments that from childhood imbue half the human race, that half instils in childhood into the whole. The first knowledge that comes to the babe in arms is that there is a protecting and supporting power, from which he receives everything, and to which he renders nothing but confidence and love. He grows into a child. Other forms rise up around him with which he finds himself in close relation. Motives of conduct are put before him; duty to parents among the first. There are few to whom a mother's voice does not suggest a reason for this duty in a divine command. The very oaths the boy will hear uttered upon the street will bear the same message in a different dress.

A race, as Renan said, lives forever on its recollections of childhood. Impressions of religion then gained are never absolutely effaced. Like the secret despatch written in lemon juice, they reappear at the touch of fire—in moments of deep feeling and supreme effort. It is by what is done at such moments that battles are won, parliamentary majorities change, dynasties fall.

The most uncompromising materialist is seldom without his obligations to early impressions for his contentment with his surroundings. There will be still, though he be not conscious of it, some lingering subjection to their power. As Dr. Barry

in his sketch of Renan has said, "the sceptic lives on a capital stored up during the days when he believed. He is a philosopher on half-pay."

Religion is a large word. Matthew Arnold's epigram expresses but a half-truth. Religion is morality—the morality of the time and of the race—touched with emotion—the emotion of the human heart. But as emotion is not self-contained, neither is it self-produced. It is a feeling of one toward another or with another, or else it is a feeling inspired by a memory of another or a conception of the ideal. The one is the more passionate: the other is the more profound. Either is a strong spring of action. But one is of the earth: the other transcends the earth. Each has often turned the course of history. It has been suddenly and sharply turned by emotions that belong to the present, that awoke or were awakened by like emotion in another. It has seldom been permanently turned or permanently guided by these. That is the work of the emotions fed by the unseen; emotions for which we owe nothing to our senses, nothing to ourselves. For if man is the measure of the universe, it is only because he sees that it is immeasurable, and feels that there is something immeasurable within himself which is a part of the immeasurable beyond himself. This feeling, this emotion of the heart, passing into a conviction of the mind, is the quickening spirit that makes our customs or morals flower into religion.

Theologians, speaking for their realm of science, call it, as it appears there, faith—or perhaps faith in those who profess the doctrines to which they adhere; superstition, in other men. Historians, as it appears in their realm of science, all see it in loyalty to national ideals, reverence for national institutions, veneration for the heroes of the past. All of them, I think it may be fairly said, have not been as ready to acknowledge its rightful power over a people when it turns their thoughts toward that transcendent energy which those call divine who feel that it brings them into a personal relation with the unseen and the unknowable.

It may take the shape of pure theism. It may find divinity shining through a human form. It may find it in every man.

The modern world, so far as the leaders of its thought can speak for it, is less confident than the world of a thousand or ten thousand years ago that there exists a being detached from all else so like ourselves that we can name it like one of us, a person, and presume to define its attributes in terms of human speech. It is more confident that there is a power in the universe that so controls or constitutes it in a settled order of relations and causation that all may safely trust in the continuance of that order without a break. It is more confident also that it is a power that, in the sum of things, makes for what is good as well as true and is worthy the highest name we can invent for it—the name of God.

If there be anything in the theory of the monist; if there be but one actuality in the universe, and that motion, or a force expressed in motion, the manner of that motion is, or seems to us, ruled by attraction. Attraction draws little things to great things: earths to suns; men—for their bodies—to the earth; but for their thinking selves it is still the dominating faith that these are in like manner, if insensibly, yet surely, drawn toward a greater thinking self, as source and end.

Ruskin said of Sainte-Beuve that he never for a moment admitted to himself the possibility of a True as well as an Ideal Spirit, or God.[1] It is precisely this which threw Sainte-Beuve out of touch with the people about him, and shut him out of the public heart. Spencer built on better foundations. His own conceptions might differ widely from those of English people. He might declare that "that which persists, unchanging in quantity but ever changing in form, under these sensible appearances which the Universe presents to us, transcends human knowledge and conception—is an unknown and unknowable Power, which we are obliged to recognize as without limit in space and without beginning or end in time."[2] But if unknowable to him, this Power was not one with which he would lightly reckon as respects its influence on others. As Frederic Harrison said—and said rightfully—Spencer "looked to the unknowable environment behind the world of sense

[1] *Letters to Charles Eliot Norton*, II. 13. [2] *Autobiography*, I. 652.

and knowledge as the sphere and object of religion." To the positivist, the unknowable environment is no less an admitted fact, but—to use Harrison's language again—"the only intelligible sphere of religion must be the knowable," and "the elements of the unknowable are immutably set in the canons of experience."

The church of the world stands nearer to Spencer. It disdains the dogma that the knowable is immutably measured by any form of human experience. The world in general rejects it. It is unscientific. Who would have said, a century ago, that the voice of a friend speaking in Denver could be heard in New York, and recognized in every intonation as easily as if he were in the same room with him who is addressed? Who would have said, twenty years ago, that a ray of light could be so framed and directed as to light up the interior of the human body and show the skeleton within it? Who would have said, ten years ago, that there was a heat-producing mineral that never cooled? What canons of scientific experience brought within the range of probable assumption marvels like these? Surely it is but reasonable to expect that the common people will look at each new discovery of such a kind as fresh proof of an intelligent creator, and another step nearer to knowledge of what He is.

The full power of such a belief is seldom felt by those who are themselves unaffected by it. For this cause, if for no other, the historian whose judgments will be accepted by future generations must write in a religious spirit. He cannot use a key too large for him to grasp. I mean here by religion a reverent consciousness of a power (be it law or spirit) manifest in nature, which is stronger than man, and a sense of obligation to answer its demands. Its common fruits, ripened by human association, have through all historic times been what in those times passed for collective virtue and self-sacrifice. The historian must respect these qualities. He must share in them, so far at least as to recognize them in others, and recognize their controlling force.

George Sand makes her Marquis de Villemer declare that "Jamais une conscience troublée, jamais un esprit faussé

n'entendront l'histoire." It will be always inclining to search out or invent some unworthy motive, some low design, in the greatest acts. It cannot comprehend that in which it has no part. Nor can the man whose conscience is untroubled and spirit true, but to whom himself the religious motive is a stranger, appreciate what may be its mastery of others. Particularly is this true where behind the religious motive is the conviction of the personality of God. He to whom the divine stands as a being detached from all beside, will go farther and dare more for the love of God or fear of God than the man to whom the divine transcends all personality and permeates whatever the universe contains. The very conception of such an immanence of God in the world is at once too vast and too subtle for the ordinary mind. It diffuses a power which the other conception concentrates. It turns a guide into a theory.

If mankind is always craving heroes to worship, much more it craves a King of Kings, eternal in the heavens. The thought of unity in nature—of a single purpose or power to which all that we see or know or feel is related—is common to most of the great religions. It is also a vital part of them. To those who are possessed by it, it seems a clew by which to trace back every event of history to its farthest source. It is distinctly a religious clew.

It naturally associates itself with the thought of unity in human authority.

To the Mahometan, religion is still the centralizing force in government that it was for a thousand years to the Christian world. Mediæval Europe could conceive only of one spiritual head and of one imperial head on earth. It was this sentiment that kept the Holy Roman Empire in life centuries after, as Voltaire declared, it was no longer Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire.

Convince the mass of any people that a change of custom or of law or no change of custom or law, that a war or no war, the maintenance of an ancient policy or the substitution of another, the support of an existing government or its overthrow, is demanded by duty to God, and you have a motive of action that is likely to prove irresistible. It is a motive easy

to apprehend, and there are always those who are ready to suggest it. Not only are they ready, but they have a vantage ground which gives to what they say peculiar weight. It is that of the church.

Between man and religion stands everywhere something in the nature of ecclesiastical authority, either self-asserted or governmentally affirmed. The formalism in religion which naturally results from an established church makes for conservatism in politics. In proportion to the hold which such a church has on the community it saps the springs of popular enthusiasm and makes against business activity. Time which would otherwise be spent in labor is consumed in feast-days or fast-days. Leisure is gained, but at high cost and under circumstances unfriendly to its best use. In public educational institutions studies of more importance are apt to be put aside for instruction in the symbols and liturgies of the church.

The same tendencies proceed in all countries from churches to which a large majority of the people belong, though not established by law, if they are ceremonial in their institutions. This cause has colored the life of the people and vitally affected the course of industry in Spanish America [1] and British India.

There are twenty American republics. Two of them, Cuba and San Domingo, are bound to us by political ties of a peculiar character. The rest shun us. We want their trade, but it goes to Europe. We want their sympathy, but what we receive is rather apprehension and suspicion. We meet them in Pan-American Congresses, but while projects are framed few are consummated. Why is it that, with their political institutions so largely copied from us, they are foreign to us in spirit? Race and language, I believe, have been less the cause than religion. Religion counts more with them in influencing habits of thought and measures of social order. The church, as such, is a greater power.

In South America and Central America the church was

[1] A striking, and not inaccurate, forecast of its probable history was made in a letter from Jefferson to Lafayette, of May 14, 1817. *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Memorial edition, XV. 116.

so long the only fountain of education that public sentiment deemed it a sufficient source. There are countries in which the state has assumed this function, where churches have been found to promote its efforts for their own sake. In Finland, for instance, in the Lutheran denomination, which there prevails, confirmation is refused to those who cannot read, and the consequence is that illiteracy is rare. So in a conquered country, if an established church survives, it may prove a nursery of patriotism. Modern Greece as an independent kingdom owes its existence to the Greek Church. This kept alive the national feeling and tongue during the long years of Turkish occupation.[1]

The church appeals to what is poetic in our nature, and as our associate President[2] Woodrow Wilson has finely said: "We live by Poetry; and not by Prose."

But the only true establishment of a church is in the hearts of those who belong to it. If they have faith in its principles, these will have a large influence in guiding their action as citizens in public affairs. Fear of its discipline, be it established or unestablished, will not.

The attitude of every important church toward socialism is antagonistic. If it become official antagonism, it loses power. Why is socialism steadily growing in political weight throughout Europe? Why in France did its friends cast nearly half a million more votes at the elections of this year than in any previous one? It is a sign of the decadence there of the power of the Vatican, pushed unwisely to the front in its encyclicals. It was a natural incident of the struggle which was separating church and state. As Professor Blondel has said of it: "Le peuple français est sans doute moins irréligieux qu'on ne le prétend quelquefois, mais il est très défiant à l'égard de tout ce qui lui apparaît comme une ingérence cléricale, et n'accorde pas volontiers sa confiance à ceux qu'il soupçonne de sympathie à l'égard du 'gouvernement des curés.'"[3]

[1] *Autobiography of Andrew D. White*, II. 439.

[2] Associate President of the American Historical Association.

[3] *Blätter für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft und Volkswirtschaftslehre*, July, 1906, p. 178.

The jealousy of clerical government on the part of the French people, however, is largely because they have learned to look on it as a government inspired from Rome, subject to Rome.

One of last year's books bears the title "Les Deux Frances." They are the France of the Blacks and the France of the Reds; of the party of King and Church, and that of Revolution. A party standing for old institutions cannot easily be displaced by a party standing for new institutions, unless these rise up as the outcome and expression of a spirit of individualism, native to the soil. If each party rests for its support on corporate influences, the struggle will be long and doubtful. There are still therefore *les deux Frances*, ever in conflict. The King —the thought of a restored monarchy—has almost disappeared as a constitutive force. But so has the Revolution. To that the corporate influences of the Republic have succeeded, and to-day it is the France of the Church contending with the France of the Republic. If the church should learn to encourage the individual initiative of its followers—to let Frenchmen direct the course in France of the Roman Church—the France of the Blacks may yet prevail.

The history of any people will be largely governed by its means of education. How far shall it extend? By whom shall it be furnished and controlled? "Educate your masters" is the command of political philosophy to the modern state. No education can be deemed complete which does not treat to some extent of religion. Yet if it be given at public expense, the cost will be borne by some who scout at all religion, and many who disagree with the prevailing forms of it.

The position which the world is gradually taking on this subject rests on principles foreshadowed in colonial Maryland and Rhode Island; first formally asserted by any government on purely humanitarian grounds in 1786 by Jefferson's statute of religious liberty in Virginia, and spread over a wider field by the Constitution of the United States.

The utmost point that had been previously reached was that religious liberty should be as great as the safety of the

state permitted. Now it was declared that no limitations were required by the safety of the state. Yet here more than almost anywhere else is seen the difficulty of reconciling it with religious sentiment.

The King of Bavaria, in a state paper early in the last century, declared that in public education religion was not to be taught at the cost of learning, nor yet learning at the cost of religion. There are still many, however, who believe it to be to the cost of learning for the state to assume to teach that, without making religion a part of it.

More than a million children are being educated in the United States every year in the various schools of the Roman Catholic Church. The cost of this can hardly be less than twenty-five or thirty million dollars. Those who pay it are also required by the state to contribute as much as any other taxpaying citizens to the support of the public schools. It is no small force which leads these men to assume such burdens. It is the conviction that education is incomplete unless religion be taught as part of it, added to the belief that the best form of religion, or we might say perhaps the only form of true religion, is that of which their own church is the expression.

Holland has profited by our experience, and since 1857 has forbidden religious instruction in her public schools. The Catholics were not content to have it given by Calvinists, nor Calvinists to let it come from Catholics. Similar considerations, fortified by an influence substantially unfelt in Holland, that of socialism, have now thoroughly secularized education in France, but only after the most bitter contests. In both English and Canadian politics the same question is now the dominating one.

The position of Russia in this respect has been one of the circumstances weakening her as a great power as well as leading directly to revolutionary change. The church has had the full direction of the public schools. For the first three years it kept the children simply learning prayers by rote, except for a little drill toward the close in mental arithmetic. No instruction in reading was required. The product of such a system is not simply popular unintelligence. It is an unreal

quietude, easily passing into a blind fury, under the influences of a century like ours.

Religious tests for ordinary offices have been largely abolished, even in monarchical governments, but whenever in these there is a state church the monarch, as its head, remains bound to it by vows so solemn as to prove the conviction of the people that nothing can safely be yielded there. The coronation oath of King Edward stood for the same dogmatic rigidity in its reference to the papacy as did that of an opposite kind imposed on his niece, the Princess Ena, before she could be Queen of Spain.[1]

There is no civilized nation in recent years where the state supports the church in which there has not been so much dissatisfaction with that policy as to inspire public opposition. In many, the opposition has already triumphed: in all, it will. The disestablishment of the church in Ireland, in the face of the solemn provision to the contrary in the Act of Union, will some day be followed by the disestablishment of the Church of England, whose numbers have recently sunk to a minority of the English people. In France, the separation of the state from the churches, first in regard to education, and then at all points, has been the great political issue for a quarter of a century. The French Revolution could not accomplish it. Though in the Constitution of 1791 it was asserted that all the property of the church belonged to the nation, and the Con-

[1] This was: "I, recognizing as true the Catholic and apostolic faith, do hereby publicly anathematize every heresy, especially that to which I have had the misfortune to belong. I agree with the Holy Roman Church, and profess with mouth and heart my belief in the Apostolic See, and my adhesion to that faith which the Holy Roman Church, by evangelical and apostolical authority, delivers to be held. Swearing this by the sacred Homoousion, or trinity of the same substance, and by the holy gospels of Christ, I do pronounce those worthy of eternal anathema who oppose this faith with their dogmas and their followers, and should I myself at any time presume to approve or proclaim anything contrary hereto, I will subject myself to the severity of the canon law. So help me God, and these his holy gospels."

cordat ten years later confirmed it, it was only in this present year that France ventured seriously to stand upon her title.

A church to which the mass of any people belongs will exert a stronger influence on them than on their leaders in civil affairs. These leaders will be better fitted to exercise an independent judgment. They will be more moved by motives of personal ambition. Religion will not be to them the one thing to elevate their thoughts beyond the narrow round of domestic life.

But of those who direct affairs in any nation in which government formally avows and teaches in its schools the existence of a higher spiritual power few will escape the conviction that in this at least there is truth. A belief in God leads to a trust in God in great emergencies, and to an inspiring identification of God and country. In war, this motive is as strong to-day as it was a thousand years ago. The "Cambridge Modern History," after giving one volume to the Reformation, devotes another to what it styles the Wars of Religion. The Wars of Religion did not end in the seventeenth century, nor in the nineteenth. France is still sore from her losses by the last.

The influences of an ecclesiastical establishment and of the simple religious motive were curiously intertwined in what led to the fall of Napoleon III. The relations of Germany to the papacy had an important influence in bringing on first the war between Austria and Prussia in 1866 and then that between France and Prussia in 1870, both fomented from Rome, as events likely to prove a check to the Protestant interest in Europe.[1] The proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles was the unexpected fruit—unexpected but not unnatural. The German fought for God and fatherland. The French were permeated by the godless philosophy of the first republic.

The German is taught religion in the school. He is reminded of it from the throne. The Emperor William, as fully as the Czar, seizes every opportunity to claim a divine sanction

[1] See *Autobiography of Andrew D. White*, II. 350.

for his authority.[1] He has thrust France aside as the universal protector of Catholic missions in the East, and found his profit in it by large territorial acquisitions in China, seized in retaliation for outrages on German missionaries. He has made his pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

France, too, of late, in the same way, has so shaped her Chinese policy that the flag has followed the missionary. The republic has clung to the ecclesiastical prerogatives of the monarchy, though with the abrogation of the Concordat it is difficult to see how its protectorate over Eastern missions can hereafter be asserted.

A religious motive in foreign affairs can only be seriously advanced when a religious motive is recognized in home affairs. The loss of that in the French Revolution was one of the first things of the consequence of which, after the restoration, Talleyrand warned Louis XVIII. when consulting with him over the best assurances with which to surround his throne. You have, said he, to deal with a people "accustomed to found their rights on their pretensions, and their pretensions on their power." "Formerly, religious influence could support royal authority; it can do so no longer, now that religious indifference has pervaded all classes, and become almost universal." "Royal authority can therefore only derive support from public opinion; and to obtain this it must be in accord with that opinion." [2]

It may be doubted whether religious indifference was so widespread in the France of 1815, when this was written. If so, it was because of a torrent of revolution which for the time had swept before it the good and the bad alike. That torrent has left to public opinion a lasting place of power over human governments, but it has also, I believe, left religion in its old place as the main foundation of public opinion.

Early in 1905 the Emperor of Germany, in a public address,[3]

[1] See particularly his speech at Coblentz, August 31, 1897, quoted in Reinsch, *World Politics*, p. 301.

[2] *Memoirs of Talleyrand*, Putnam's edition, III. 130, 147.

[3] On March 9, 1905, in an address before the naval recruits at Wilhelmshaven.

declared that the defeats of Russia in her war with Japan were due to the deplorable condition of Russian Christianity. It was deplorable because directed by a state church which failed to respond to the spirit of the times. None of its members could abandon it for another without forfeiting all civil rights, including that of holding property. Its principal functionary, M. Pobedonostseff, was a conservative of the conservatives, to whom the Orthodox Greek Church seemed the only thing that bound the many peoples of Russia into the Russian people.[1] The creed of this church is mediæval: of its teachings and influence Tolstoi has told, and the world believes him.

The very month after the sharp words of the German Emperor, the Czar, against the protest of Pobedonostseff, decreed religious liberty; and his subsequent convocation of the Douma was closely followed by directions to the Metropolitan who is president of the Holy Synod to call a general council of the Orthodox Greek Church. No such council had met since 1654. It can hardly fail to give a new direction to the religious life of the mass of the Russian people.[2] Already they have shown a new interest in what it stands for, by a general inquiry for copies of the Bible. More parts of Bibles and Testaments were sold in Russia last year than in any year before, over half a million in European Russia alone. The fruits have not thus far made for peace, but they may be worth more than peace.

A department of the Holy Synod until recently, as a bureau of "Spiritual Censure," held control of all publications on ecclesiastical history, theology, or philosophy. Nothing could be published or sold on these topics without its permission. It is worth noting that from 1863 this bureau forbade the circulation of any part of the Old Testament, except the Psalms, in the languages of the people. There was too much in the other books that breathed the spirit of revolution.

[1] *Autobiography of Andrew D. White*, II. chap. 36.

[2] Before these changes, Pobedonostseff and his school had relied on the popular reverence for religion as the main support of autocracy. If there be such a thing as a religious stage of development for nations, Russia was still in it. The events of 1906 would indicate that reverence, for her state church at least, had been seriously weakened.

It may indeed be safely said that no single cause for the spread of religious liberty and, by consequence, of civil liberty in modern times has been so powerful as the circulation of the Bible in all languages. It is to-day pronounced by publishers to be the best-selling book in the world.[1] The market for it has steadily broadened with and because of the new latitude of interpretation and criticism countenanced by modern churches.

The last sixty or seventy years has indeed given to Christendom a new Bible. It is not that so very much has been discovered by archæologists or worked out by critical research, which was unknown before, but because the attitude of Christian people and Christian ministers toward biblical study has become gradually revolutionized. Textual homiletics, textual theology, unscientific theories of interpretation, have become generally discredited. The spirit of free inquiry, which not long ago characterized but a few men like Strauss and Renan, has now begun to characterize all real Christian scholarship in the United States and most of it in the world at large. Here, from the absence of religious establishments and the presence of universal education at public charge, it has naturally had free scope. It has given a prominence before unknown in modern times, outside of China, to character and conduct as the foundations of a true life. It has brought the general Christian world to look upon them as about the only evidence worth having that in any man earth has been brought close to heaven, while still maintaining that character and conduct are the fruits of the ideal, the children of faith in the invisible and eternal. It has brought the wider world of civilized mankind in all continents to care little for a man's theological beliefs, everything for his beliefs, his real beliefs, as to what is the true, the good, and the beautiful.

Panislamism has gained a fresh inspiration from this source.

[1] The North India Bible Society, which is sixty years old, published and circulated, between 1890 and 1900, a yearly average of 87,000 copies of Bibles, New Testaments, and selected portions of them. Since 1900 this annual output has been nearly doubled, and the number rose in 1905 to 195,879.

The Young Turkish Party, already recognized as an important political force, founds itself on treating the Koran with the same free hand with which Christians treat the Bible, and so bringing its teachings into harmony with the new thought of a new time.

During the last few years the American people have insisted, to a marked degree, on the observance of higher ethical standards on the part of their public and of their business men. The movement in this direction has been a steady one for more than half a century. In 1843 the foremost English novelist, fresh from a visit to the United States, could speak of it as "that Republic, but yesterday let loose upon her noble course, and but to-day so maimed and lame, so full of sores and ulcers, foul to the eye and almost hopeless to the sense, that her best friends turn from the loathsome creature with disgust."[1] So severe an arraignment was unjustified in 1843. It would have been impossible and unthinkable at any time since, let us say, the Civil War. But it was not the Civil War that elevated the moral standards of the people. War is a salvation to some souls, a damnation to many more. "Treasons, stratagems, and spoils"—the spoils of the field and the spoils of the army contractor—make a poor soil for the growth of public morals. The American people have grown to a purer life, or at least to a demand for a purer life on the part of those who lead their fortunes, mainly by force of a world movement, which has simply found here the freest play.

The better relations between Jew and Christian that now generally exist are attributable, in no small degree, to the growth of this ethical spirit; not so much because ethics make for fraternity, as that this growth proceeds from a tendency on the part of Christians toward acceptance of the same fundamental religious principles. The Jew has never troubled himself very much with the question of personal immortality, and all that goes with it of responsibility and retribution. His aim has been to make the best of earth; his hope that of a Messianic era here. Christian theology has looked more to a future

[1] Dickens in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, chap. xxii.

world as the real home of men, in an abode or state that, happy or miserable, was to endure forever.

Christendom, during the last few years, has been approaching the Judaic view, as best expressive of the immediate objects to be pursued in human life. Hence among those peoples which have gone farthest in this direction, the political and social condition of the Jews is more favorable than among those—like Russia, Roumania, and Austria—which have made no substantial change of position. If his life on this earth be the great thing for a man to regulate and plan for, why complain if the Jew wins the prizes of trade and wealth, though it be by concentrating his attention on material gains? "Go thou and do likewise" is becoming, perhaps too fast and with too little qualification, the general motto of the business world.

Christian theology anticipated evolution in endeavoring to account for what is base in human nature. It set it to the account of original sin. To raise up a being infected with that not simply from his birth, but through an inheritance from ancestors infected with it for countless generations, was a task which God only could accomplish. To Him it was the work of a moment; and they called it salvation.

It was a theory well calculated to have a profound effect on the human mind. It gave an immense power to a priesthood believed to have the power of speaking for God and declaring to any man that his salvation had been accomplished. It put them by the side of kings and above kings.

A time has come when the leaders of the church are beginning to say with John Fiske that "original sin is neither more nor less than the brute inheritance which every man carries with him, and the process of evolution is an advance toward true salvation."

The church is changing—has changed—its ground. It is not losing—has not lost—its power. It makes use of the old truth in a new way. It was right at bottom.

The unfolding of the law of evolution from the first, for those who accepted it, unquestionably tended to narrow the order of things in which man has his being. As the bond be

tween him and the lowest forms of life became visibly stronger, that between him and any form of life higher than himself became visibly weaker. He was of less importance in the world. Wallace could open the gates to the new vision of the past; he could not shut them. He could not lead men to any new standpoint from which they could look on the earth as the centre of the intellectual or moral universe.

The church, at first, everywhere disinclined—still much of it disinclined—to accept the theory of evolution with all that it implies, has begun to readjust itself to its new environment. If, she says, this new evolution can produce from some single torpid cell a being with the intellectual and moral force of man, why may not man contain the torpid cell out of which in some at least may be evolving and ultimately, in some other stage of being, may be evolved what for want of a better word we call a Spirit—something with an energy akin to what we name divine? Force is persistent. That it is we know. What it is we do not know. If persistent in what is material, why not persistent in what is immaterial? If persistent in what we call time and space, why not persistent in something which we do not dare to call time or space and vaguely name eternity?

But questions like these do not much concern the mass of humankind. The leaders of intellectual life are few. They are followed at a long interval. They know this well. It is their office, in every generation, to set the goal, but to moderate rather than to speed the pace of the people as they turn in the new direction.

The leaders of intellectual life who are in positions of ecclesiastical authority, under the influence of these forces, have everywhere begun to preach a new theology. It is a theology of the present. It might almost be called a theology of the earth, earthy. Its foundation is still the existence of a great first cause, which men call God. Its aim is still to set forth the whole duty of man, and to found it on his duty toward this almighty and eternal source of his being. But it sets forth with less assumption of a knowledge of the unseen. No Nicene creed, no creed professing to define the genesis and nature and attributes of God, could ever be the product of the twentieth century.

The modern pulpit and council are content to say with St. Paul that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." The churches of every faith, in some degree—of all in proportion to their share in the time-spirit of their generation—are pointing to Man as the only real revelation of the nature of God, and to the opportunities of the present life as what chiefly concerns him, in his highest as well as his lowest desires and activities. One hears little in churches led by an educated clergy of a future heaven, and less of a future hell. It is this pressing, immediate world about us, that is their theme. "One world at a time" is more and more becoming the practical doctrine of the modern pulpit. Do your duty to-day, and be not anxious about to-morrow, whether it be the morrow of the next sunrise or of a million ages.

What has been, what is to be, the effect of this change in the attitude of the church on the course of human history? It will not remove the power of theistic appeal. If it should spread over all nations, and all faiths, it will leave unimpaired the motives of duty to God and country. A war to maintain the honor of fatherland and of the fathers from whom it was inherited will always enlist the sympathies of the people with double force, if they are quickened by religious convictions.

Recent events have shown that soldiers who believe they are fighting God's battles may yield before those not superior in numbers or arms who believe that in fighting they are honoring the first ancestors of the sovereign, whose spirit in an ancestor world holds sway over those of their own ancestors. The double character of the Mikado of Japan as spiritual leader and earthly sovereign, impressed by the institution of ancestor worship upon every Japanese from infancy, moves him far more deeply than the Russian muzhik is affected by his reverence for the Czar as head of his country's church. Admiral Togo's message to the Mikado last year, attributing to his superhuman influence the annihilation of the Russian fleet, spoke the real conviction of a great man and a great people.

We must never forget that not only were the founders of all the great religions of Asiatic origin, but that religion is now a

more vital force in Asia than on any other continent. The deep, if dreamy, spiritual insight, the brooding intellectual habit, the strength of antecedents, that belong to the East, put religion there in a position as lofty as it is unique.

Hegel observed that there are two natural steps in human life, that of subjectivity and objectivity. The youth bends his thoughts toward the correspondence that he is to establish between himself and the universe. He proceeds from himself outward. He joins his life to the ideal, in hope and faith. Years pass and he has found his place. There is a round of daily duties and perhaps of pleasures, on which his attention centres. His thoughts now turn not to the ideal but to what life in fact has brought him, and to how that shall be best accomplished.

The race of man pursues the same stages. In the East they are still in the first. Even in Japan, so largely occidentalized, they are constructing for themselves a new ideal of Christianity. Except for Japan, they are what they were. Subjectivity still holds them captive.

China has recently abolished the requirement of familiarity with the Confucian classics on the part of those desiring official appointment or promotion. The first examination under the new system took place this fall, and the nine receiving the highest marks were men educated in the United States or Europe—the first of them a doctor of philosophy and the next a doctor of civil law of an American university.

A change like this involves, as a necessary consequence, the rise of new national ideals. The calm and restful tone of the Confucian philosophy of life will be replaced by something less smooth and more deep, more religious. The spirit of the West has burst upon the silent sea of self-satisfied seclusion on which China has been idly floating for two thousand years. It has troubled the waters. It may turn them into a river that will run far.

As respects Mahometanism, the fundamental precepts of that faith are such as necessarily to give them a strong political effect.[1] Its adherents stand together, like the members

1 Only by force of the Treaty of Berlin of 1878 has religious toleration been anything but an empty word at Constantinople.

of a secret order. In Europe they cling to their religion as closely as in Asia. In 1900 seven thousand Mahometan Servians suddenly left the country, because one Mahometan had been received into a Christian church.[1]

The strongest assurance of the power of the Sublime Porte is the general recognition by the Mahometan world, and the King of Great Britain as Emperor of India, of the Sultan of Turkey as the true Caliph or Commander of the Faithful. The strongest menace of the British Empire in the East is the utter foreignness there of Western Christianity. The European sent to Asia or Africa to govern a subject race finds himself separated from it by an aloofness which he cannot conquer. It does not proceed from him. He is often anxious to overcome it in the native. But it is the inevitable fruit of antipathetic relations, springing from religious differences.

The religions of the West rule the religionist. The religion of Islam rules every Mahometan, be he saint or sinner; and in case of war all are faithful to the commander of the faithful. Lord Cromer, a few months ago, received a warning letter from one professing to write in the name of his people of Egypt, and whose stately periods remind one of the Hebrew prophets. It was addressed to "the Reformer of Egypt."

"He must be blind [said the writer], who sees not what the English have wrought in Egypt: the gates of justice stand open to the poor; the streams flow through the land and are not stopped at the order of the strong; the poor man is lifted up and the rich man pulled down; the hand of the oppressor and the briber is struck when outstretched to do evil. Our eyes see these things and we know from whom they come. You will say, 'Be thankful, O, men of Egypt! and bless those who benefit you'; and very many of us—those who preserve a free mind and are not ruled by flattery and guile—are thankful. But thanks lie on the surface of the heart, and beneath is a deep well.

"While peace is in the land the spirit of Islam sleeps. We

[1] Francis H. E. Palmer, *Austro-Hungarian Life* (New York, 1903), p. 88.

hear the imam cry out in the mosque against the unbelievers, but his words pass by like wind and are lost. Children hear them for the first time and do not understand them; old men have heard them from childhood and pay no heed.

"But it is said, 'There is war between England and Abdul-Hamid Khan.' If that be so, a change must come. The words of the imam are echoed in every heart, and every Moslem hears only the cry of the faith. As men we do not love the sons of Osman; the children at the breast know their words, and that they have trodden down the Egyptians like dry reeds. But as Moslems they are our brethren; the Khalif holds the sacred places and the noble relics. Though the Khalif were hapless as Bajazid, cruel as Murad, or mad as Ibrahim, he is the shadow of God, and every Moslem must leap up at his call as the willing servant to his master, though the wolf may devour his child while he does his master's work. The call of the Sultan is the call of the faith; it carries with it the command of the Prophet, blessings, etc. I and many more trust that all may yet be peace; but if it be war, be sure that he who has a sword will draw it, he who has a club will strike with it. The women will cry from the housetops, 'God give victory to Islam!'

"You will say: 'The Egyptian is more ungrateful than a dog, which remembers the hand which fed him. He is foolish as the madman who pulls down the rooftree of his house upon himself.' It may be so to worldly eyes, but in the time of danger to Islam the Moslem turns away from the things of this world and thirsts only for the service of his faith, even though he looks in the face of death. May God (His name be glorified) avert the evil."

It is the existence of this spirit which makes the punishments often inflicted on insurgents by the British in their Eastern possessions sharp up to the point of barbarism. Nothing less tells there.

It is the mosque that guards the palace of the Sultan.

Sir William Marriott, when in company with Ismail Pasha, the first Khedive of Egypt, happened to meet in Bou-

logne a procession of young girls on their way to their first communion. The Pasha saluted it with a low reverence. "Your Highness is more Catholic than the Catholics," said Sir William. "Ah," was the reply, "you see I have ruled, and no man can rule without religion."[1]

On this point East and West can both agree. Napoleon said in reference to the Concordat of 1801, that he saw in the church not the mystery of the incarnation but the mystery of social order. Later, at the height of his power, speaking in the same vein, he intimated his belief that Christianity was an illusion, but a very useful one. It assured the tranquillity of the state in reconciling man with himself and giving him a philosophy to live by. The age of illusions was for nations, as for individuals, the age of happiness.[2]

It is not for history to pronounce whether any religion or all religions be founded on mere illusions. She must leave that to theologians and psychologists. But in her field of inductive sociology, she owns still the continuing force of the religious motive.

In modern politics it takes on a new importance. They are expressed in terms of representative government. It may be representation by a legislature or by a ministry. In either case it will assume to represent the people by representing a party. Representative government implies and involves party organization. Party organization is unfavorable to the expression of candid, impartial public opinion. But let any religious question be involved, and public opinion will find a way to express itself, which no party machinery can seriously obstruct.

So in world politics, now so largely governed by a public opinion of the world, the pressure that can be brought upon any one power by others—that is brought upon each by other peoples through the press—will be immensely strengthened if it be impelled by an ethical or religious motive; ethical or religious, for an ethical impulse common to many nations belongs to the religion of humanity.

[1] *Memoirs of Grant Duff*, II. 18.

[2] *Memoirs of Talleyrand*, Putnam's edition, I. 339.

That grows as ecclesiasticism declines. The Christian church has been gradually reduced, to use the phrase of Gardiner, "from the exercise of power to the employment of influence." Its tendencies of thought run, more than those fostered by any other of the great religions, toward loyalty to humanity, rather than to race. It is the only one that makes any serious effort to preach its gospel "to every creature." "We recognize," said Tertullian, "one commonwealth, the world." It does not hesitate to put its own rules above those assumed for political science or economy. From the churches of England came the last great impulse that carried through the Corn Laws, and made free trade her policy to-day. There are signs of a movement in the churches of the United States in the same direction. Should it gather force, statesmen must reckon seriously with it.

Renan, in his "Life of Jesus,"[1] remarks that he was the first of men to conceive, or at all events to put life into that thought, that liberty was something independent of politics; that one's country is not everything; and that the man is anterior and superior to the citizen.

The share of government in human society becomes less obtrusive as time goes on. Show of force declines as the sentiment of obedience to law becomes more prevalent. Public authority is more and more localized in small political communities, there to be administered by representatives of the inhabitants. These social principles go to diminish the weight of national governments, and make the individual man feel that he is a citizen first of his own local community and then of the world. They also strongly reinforce the general trend of the Christian religion (which we may fairly say is to-day the strongest of any in its influence upon human history) toward insistence on universal brotherhood as the ultimate criterion of international obligations.

[1] Chapter vii.

XXXV

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION

"SOCIAL CULTURE IN EDUCATION AND RELIGION"

BY

WILLIAM T. HARRIS, L.LD.

FORMER UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

ACCEPTING on the high authority of Professor Baldwin the vast importance of the influence of religion upon modern life, the obverse of that same question, the meaning of religion, its outlook, its historical development, becomes equally important. It is this problem of the growth of religious thought, its educational influence upon man and upon his educational institutions, which is here taken up by Mr. William T. Harris, for many years, and until his recent retirement, the United States Commissioner of Education. This address was first delivered by Mr. Harris before the International Congress of Arts and Sciences at the St. Louis exhibition. It has since appeared in the Educational Review, *and is here published under Mr. Harris's revision.*

I SHALL announce as my thesis that: Social Culture is the training of the individual for social institutions.

Man by his social institutions secures the adjustment of the individual to the social whole—the social unit. The person, or individual, comes into such harmony and co-operation with human society as a whole that he may receive a share of all the production of his fellow-men; be protected against violence by their united strength; given the privilege of accumulating

property and of enjoying it in peace and security, in such a manner as to escape from sudden approaches of famine and penury by reason of seasonal extremes or by reason of the vicissitudes of infancy, old age, disease, or of the perturbations affecting the community. And finally, there is participation in the wisdom of the race—the opportunity of sharing in the knowledge that comes from the scientific inventory of nature in all its kingdoms, and of human life on the globe in all its varied experiments, successful and unsuccessful; the opportunity of gaining an insight into the higher results of science in the field of discovery of laws and principles—the permanent forms of existence under the variable conditions of time and place. Finally, we may share, through our membership in the social unity, in the moral insights that have resulted from the discipline of pain, the defeats and discomfitures arising from the choice of mistaken careers on the part of individuals and entire communities. The sin and error of men have vicariously helped the race by great object lessons which have taught mankind through all the ages, and now teach the present generation of men—all the more effectively because of the devices of our civilization which not only make the records of the past accessible to each and every individual, but institute a present means of intercommunication by and through which each people—each individual—may see from day to day the unfolding of the drama of human history.

The good of this unity of the individual with the social whole by means of institutions may be summed up by saying that it re-enforces the individual by the labor of all, the thought of all, and the good fortune of all. It takes from him only his trifling contribution from his trade or vocation, and gives in return a share in the gigantic aggregate of productions of all mankind. It receives from him the experience of his little life and gives him in return the experience of the race, a myriad of myriads strong, and working through millenniums.

What Thomas Hobbes said of the blessings of the political whole, the State, is true when applied to civilization as an international combination of States.

"Outside of the State," said he, "is found only the dominion

of the passions—war, fear, poverty, filth, isolation, barbarism, ignorance, and savagery; while in the State is found the dominion of reason—peace, security, riches, ornament, sociability, elegance, science, and good-will."

With this point of view we see at a glance the potency of the arts of social culture, fitting as they do the individual for a co-operative life with his fellow-men in the institutions of civilization.

My thesis proceeds from this insight to lay down the doctrine that the first social culture is religion and that religion is the foundation of social life in so far as that social life belongs to the history of civilization. Religion in the first place is not merely the process of an individual mind, but it is a great social process of intellect and will and heart. Its ideas are not the unaided thoughts of individual scholars, but the aggregate results of a social activity of intellect, so to speak; each thought of the individual being modified by the thought of his community so that it comes to the individual with the substantial impress of authority.

There is a religious social process, the most serious of all social activity. In it the religious view of the world is shaped and delivered to the individual by authority such as cannot be resisted by him except with martyrdom. Each modification in the body of religious doctrine has come through individual innovation, but at the expense of disaster to his life. He had to sacrifice his life so far as his ordinary prosperity was concerned, and his doctrine had to be taken up by his fellow-men acting as a social whole, and translated into their mode of viewing divine revelation before it effected a modification in the popular faith. It was a process of social assimilation of the product of the individual comparable to the physiologic process by which the organs of the body take up a portion of food and convert it into a blood corpuscle before adding it to the bodily structure.

So in the living church of a people goes on forever the great process of receiving new views from its members, and its members include not only the Saint Bernards, but also the Voltaires.

The Church receives the new views, but does not by any means adopt them until it has submitted them to the negative process of criticism and elimination, and finally to the transforming process that selects the available portions for assimilation and nutriment. This is certainly the slowest and most conservative spiritual process that goes on in civilization. But it is by all means the most salutary. The individuals that suggest the most radical modifications are swiftly set aside, and their result is scarcely visible in the body of faith transmitted to the next generation.

It is clear this conservatism is necessary. Any new modification of doctrine gets adopted only by the readjustment of individuals within the communion or church. All the inertia of the institution is against it. Again, it is not only necessary but desirable, because it is a purification process, the transmutation of what is individual and tainted with idiosyncrasy, into what is universal and well adapted for all members within the communion. The Church must prove all things and hold fast to that which can stand the test. The test is furnished by what is old, by what is already firmly fixed in the body of religious faith. If its foundations could be uprooted so that religion gave up the body of its faith, all authority would go at once to the ground, and with it the relation of the institutional whole to the individuals within it. Such an event can scarcely be conceived in a realizing sense, but a study of the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution aids one to gain a point of view. When a citizen finds himself in a social whole in which all the principles that have governed the community have become shaky, he gets to be unable to count on any particular set of social reactions in his neighbors from day to day, or to calculate what motives they may entertain in their minds in the presence of any practical situation. He is forced into an attitude of universal suspicion of the intentions of his fellow-men, and he is in his turn a general object of suspicion himself. The solution forced on the community is the adoption, by the Committee of Safety, of death for all suspected ones. But the more deaths the more suspicion. For the relatives of the slain—those who yesterday were with us, but who en-

deavored to dissuade us from guillotining their parents, brothers, or cousins—as to those we are warranted in suspecting that they to-day are planning a new revolution and to-morrow may put us to death.

We may by this, after a sort, realize the situation when the foundations of religious belief are utterly broken up.

Fortunately for us our civilization carries with it, even under varying creeds, sects, and denominations, the great body of religious belief unquestioned. Only the Nihilists offer a radical denial to this body of Christian doctrine, and we can see how easily we might come to a Reign of Terror if it were possible to spread this Nihilistic doctrine widely among any considerable class of our people. For the Nihilistic view would extend its death remedy, after the destruction of its enemies, to its own ranks, and guillotine its own Robespierres by reason of suspicion and distrust entertained toward one's accomplices.

The substantiality of the view of religion is the basis of civilization. It holds conservatively to elementary notions of an affirmative character such as the monogamic marriage, the protection of helpless infancy in certain fundamental rights, the protection of women; the care for the aged and the weaklings of society; private ownership of property, including under property land and franchises as well as movable chattels. The Church includes in its fundamentals the security of life against violence, and makes murder the most heinous of crimes. It insists on respect for established law and for the magistrates themselves. It even goes so far as to protect the heretic and to insure the private right of the individual to dissent from the established or prevalent religious creeds so far as church worship or dogmas of theology are concerned. It is obvious that the community as a social whole would be obliged to limit its toleration of private creeds were there a great extension of Nihilism possible or were there to arise sects that attacked the sacredness of the family institution—by polygamy, for example, or by the abolition of marriage; or sects that attacked civil society by attempting practically to abolish the ownership of property (Proudhon said, "All property is robbery"); or by

the denial of the right of laborers to contract with employers for their labor.

When we study these fundamental ideas common to the different confessions of our composite church, we see at once how powerful is the established doctrine of the prevailing religious ideal in our civilization in exerting an authoritative control over individuals as to belief and practice.

Many people have come to believe, in this age of greatly extended religious toleration, that the Church as an institution is moribund, and that its authority is about to disappear wholly from the earth in an age of science, of the ballot box, and of universal secular education at public expense. It would seem to them that public opinion is sufficient or about to become sufficient, by means of the newspaper and the book, to secure life, personal liberty, and the peaceful pursuit of happiness, without the necessity for a religious provision for social culture. Only the culture that comes from the secular school is adjudged to be necessary for all.

For the proper consideration of this question it is necessary to take up more fundamentally the origin and real function of religion. We shall find two fundamental views of nature and man the foundation of two opposite religious movements in the world history—the Christian and the Oriental. According to one of these views our free secular life, our science and the arts, our literature and our productive industry and our commerce, are utterly perverse and not to be tolerated on any terms.

A year ago or more there was published a letter written by an Arab Sheik of Bagdad to the editor of a Paris newspaper (*La Revue* for March, 1902), in which he expressed admiration for certain external characteristics of European civilization, but found no words bitter enough for his detestation of the Christian religion professed by all European nations. To him it was all a horrible blasphemy. The pure One as preached in the Koran is sovereign and transcendent, and to speak of it as divine-human, or as triune in the Christian sense, is to the Mahometan an act of unspeakable sacrilege. Therefore

if our triumphs in science and art flow from our religion the worshipper of Islam must regard them as his mortal foe.[1] And yet the Arab Sheik is much nearer to the Christian view than is the Buddhist or the Brahmin. The East Indian view holds a first principle that repudiates or shuts out from its attributes consciousness and will and feeling—all the elements of personality. But the Allah of the Koran is personal and in an

[1] *Le Dernier Mot de l'Islam à l'Europe.* Par le Sheikh Abdul Hagk de Bagdad; Paris, *La Revue* No. 5 (1st March, 1902). Passage translated from the beginning:

"Christian Peoples: The hatred of Islam against Europe is implacable. After ages of effort to effect a reconciliation between us, the only result to-day is that we detest you more than ever. This civilization of yours and its marvels of progress which have rendered you so rich and so powerful, be it known to you that we hate them and we spurn them with our very souls . . . the Mohammedan religion is to-day in open hostility against your world of progress. . . . We explain how it is that we spurn with horror not only your religious doctrines but all your science, all your arts, and everything that comes from Christian Europe . . . I the humble Sheik Abdul Hagk, member of the holy Panislamistic league, come with a special mission to explain clearly how this comes to be. . . . Our creed is this: There is in the universe one sole being, God, source of all power, of all light, of all truth, of all justice, and of all goodness; He has not been generated; He has not generated any one. He is single, infinite, eternal; Alone, He wished to be known; He made the universe, He created man. He surrounded man with the splendors of creation and imposed on him the sacred duty of worshipping Him alone. To worship continually this only God is man's only mission on earth. Man's soul is immortal; his life on earth only a probation . . . the supreme duty of man to worship the only God and to sacrifice himself to Him without reserve; the sum of all iniquity to renounce the only God and to worship a false God . . . for us Mussulmans there is a world containing only two kinds of human beings, believers and infidels (mécréants); love, charity, brotherhood to the believers; contempt, disgust, hatred, and war for the infidels. Among the infidels the most hated and the most criminal are those who worship God but ascribe to Him earthly parents, or fatherhood, or a human mother. Such monstrous blindness seems to us to surpass all measure of iniquity: the presence among us of infidels of this kind is the plague of our life; their doctrine is a direct menace to the purity of our faith; contact with them is defilement, and any relation with them whatever a torment to our souls."

important sense ethical, having the attributes of righteousness and goodness borrowed from the Old Testament by the Hanyf preachers of the Ebionitic sect of Old Testament Christians who proselyted Mahomet, as shown by Sprenger.[1] But Brahma is above the ethical distinctions of good and evil, and goodness and righteousness are as naught to him and to the Yogi who seeks by mortification to get rid of his selfhood.

Let us endeavor to find, by the well-known road taken by the philosophy of history, the twofold root of all human experience which gives rise to the religious insights which in their first form of external authority govern human life before the advent of the stage of reflection and individual free thought —religion before secular education.

Examine life and human experience as we may, we find our attention drawn to two aspects or opposite poles, so to speak, of each object presented to us.

The first aspect includes all that is directly perceivable by the five senses—sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch. This is the aspect of immediate existence.

But experience begins at once to go beyond the immediate aspect and to find that it is a product or effect of outlying causes. We are not satisfied with it as an immediate existence; it now comes to be for us an effect or mediated existence.

If we call the first aspect an effect, we shall call this second aspect a causal process.

Each immediate object, whether it be thing or event, is an effect, and beyond it we seek the causes that explain it. The first pole of existence is therefore immediate existence, and the second is the causal chain in which the object, whether it be considered as thing or as event, is found.

Since the causal process contains the explanation of immediate existence, the knowledge which is of most importance is that knowledge which includes the completest chain of causation. It is the knowledge of primal cause which contains the

[1] *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed;* Berlin 1869. Chapter I., pp. 16-27, 37-47, 60, 69, 70-77, 101-107.

fulness of explanation. And the mind of the human race has devoted itself chiefly to the question of first cause.

In this search, as already suggested, it has been the mind of the social whole of a people that has done the thinking, rather than the minds of mere individuals. Even the most enlightened individuals and the most original and capable ones have borrowed the main body of their ideas from the religious tradition of their people, and their success in effecting modifications and new features in the existing creed has been due to the co-operation of like-minded contemporaries which assisted the utterance of the new idea so far as to make it prevail. Again, the collisions of peoples settled by war and conquest have brought about new syntheses of religious doctrine which have resulted in deeper religious insight and more consistent views of the divine nature.

It has been the long-continued process of pondering on the second aspect of things and events, the second pole of experience, that has reached the religious dogmas of the greater and greatest religions of human history—a process of social units in which whole peoples have merged.

This process has been a study of the question how the perfect One can be conceived as making a world of imperfect beings. For imperfect or derivative beings demand another order of being, an originating source, as a logical condition of existence. But this source must explain not only the efficient cause of the imperfect, but also the motive or purpose, the final cause or end, of the creation of the imperfect being.

There are two great steps which religion takes after it leaves ancestor worship and other forms of animism, in which disembodied individuals as good or evil demons reign as personal causes in an order above the natural order of things and events which are immediately present to our senses.

As the intellect of man became developed, socially and individually, the great step was taken above all secondary causes to a first cause transcending nature and also transcending time and space—the logical conditions of finitude and multiplicity.

The transcendent unity, in which all things and events lost

their individual being and mingled in one chaotic confusion, is conceived as a great void into which all things and events are resolved when traced to their first principle.

Transcendence was in the first stage of religious contemplation the important attribute to be kept in mind when thinking of the First Cause.

To halt in this thought of mere transcendence of the world meant pantheism in the sense that the One is conceived to possess all being and to be devoid of finitude. It exists apart in an order above all finitude, as found in our experience. To deny all relation to finitude comes as a result from this abstract thought of the infinite. It is the nothing of the world of experience and is to be thought of as its dissolution. The philosophy of Kapila in the Sankhya Karika, the religion of both the Yoga doctrines, the Yoga of complete asceticism (of Patanjali) as well as the Karma Yoga expounded in the Bhagavad Gita, reach a One not only above things and events and above a world order, but also elevated even above creatorship—and above intellect and will—a pure being that is as empty as it is pure, having no distinctions within itself nor for others—light and darkness, the widest distinction in nature, are all the same to Brahma, and so also are good and evil, sin and virtue, "shame and fame," as Emerson names these ethical distinctions in his poem of Brahma—they are all one to Brahma.

When the social mind had reached this insight of the transcendence of the Great First Cause we see that it lost the world of things and events and had annulled one of the two poles of experience which it was attempting to explain. And it had left in its thought only a great negative abstraction, pure being or pure naught, with no positive distinctions, not even consciousness, nor the moral idea of ethics, goodness and righteousness or mercy and justice. It was obliged to deny the creation altogether and conceive the world as a vast dream, a maya.

Asia's chief thought is this idea of transcendence of the One First Cause, above the world and above creation and creative

activity. But in the Old Testament we have the last word of Asia; it reveals an insight which reacts against the thought of this abstract oneness as transcendental Being, and sets in its place the idea of a creator.

God as creator makes the world, but does not lose his sovereignty by this act. He also retains consciousness, inward distinction; he is personal, having intellect and will and also feeling.

The pantheistic idea which conceived God only as transcendent One, followed its thought out to the denial of all creative activity and even to the denial of all inward distinction of subject and object. It ended its search for a first cause (following out the causal line which it began with) by denying causality altogether and finding only a quiet, empty being devoid of finitude within itself and annihilating objective finitude altogether. Hence its search ended with the denial of true being to the world and to man.

But this self-contradiction was corrected by the Israelitic people, who felt an inward necessity—a logical necessity—of conceiving the First Cause as active, both as intellect making internal distinctions of subject and object, and also as a free will creating a world of finite reality in which it could reveal itself as goodness. The essence of goodness, in the Old Testament sense of the idea, consists in imparting true being to that which has it not—God creates real beings. Goodness not only makes others, but gives them rights; that is to say, gives them claims on its consideration.

While Orientalism with the single idea of transcendence or sovereignty arrived at the idea of a One without the many, and at a consequent destruction of what it set out to explain, Theism found a First Cause that could explain the world as created by an ethical being, a personal One that possessed what we call "character," namely a fixed self-determination of will—of which the two elements were goodness and righteousness. This doctrine conceived ethics as a fundamental element in the character of the Absolute, a primordial form of being belonging to the First Cause.

Time and space according to the first form of religion—

that is to say, according to the first completed thought arrived at by the social intelligence of the race—are illusions and the producer of illusions. All illusions arise in the primordial distinction of subject and object which constitutes the lapse into consciousness out of primeval unity which is not subject and object.[1] This thought of Kapila becomes the basis of the religion of Buddhism, the religion founded on the simple idea of transcendence of the One First Cause above all causality. This is opposite to the religion of the Bible, which reveals the divine as a One that is goodness. Goodness is so gracious as to create and give independent reality to nature and man—in short, to make man able to sin and to defy the First Cause his Creator. Here emerges for the first time the idea of sin. Man, as maya or illusion, is not created nor is he a creator of things or events—his deeds are only seeming, for he does not possess true reality himself. But with the doctrine of theism man has an eternal selfhood given him and is responsible for the acts of his will; he can sin and repent.

He can choose the ethical and form in himself the image of God, or on the other hand he can resist the divine and create an Inferno.

While theism commands man to renounce selfishness, pantheism commands to renounce selfhood.

Theism contains in it as a special prerogative the possibility of meeting difficulties insoluble to pantheism. It has solved the great difficulty of conceiving a first cause so transcendent that it is no cause of the world and man. For theism sees the necessity of goodness and righteousness in the first cause and hence finds the world and man in the divine mind. But it, too, sees divine sovereignty and does not lose that thought in its theory of man and nature. Nature is full of beings that perish, notwithstanding the fact that they come from a perfect Creator. The history of man is full of sin and rebellion against goodness and righteousness. But our theistic insight knows that God is holy; that he possesses perfect goodness and righteousness. The exclusive contemplation of the imperfections of man and

[1] Memorial verses of the Sankhya Karika, Nos. XXI, XXII, XXIV, LXII, LXIV.

even of his best works leads to the pantheistic denial of the world and to despair as to man's salvation before the sovereign first cause. The religion of theism often lapses toward Orientalism in its condemnation of nature and history as empty of all good. Whenever it has gone so far that it blasphemes the First Cause by limiting divine goodness, the Church has given a check to this tendency and ushered in an epoch of missionary effort, wherein the true believer leaves off his excessive practice of self-mortification and devotes himself like St. Francis to the work of carrying salvation to the lost. It goes out like St. Dominic to save the intellect and to have not only pious hearts but pious intellects that devote their lives to the study of the creation, trying to see how God works in his goodness, giving true being to his creatures, and lifting them up into rational souls able to see the vision of God.[1]

The piety of the intellect contains in it also another possibility of lapse into impiety of intellect, namely through lack of power to hold to the sovereignty of God. It may go astray from the search of the first cause and set up secondary causes in place of a first cause. This is the opposite danger to pantheism, which gets so much intoxicated with the divine unity that it neglects nature and history, and discourages intellectual piety, and loses the insight into the revelation of God's goodness and righteousness in the creation of the world.

There are two kinds of intellectual impiety, one kind that goes astray after a secondary cause in place of a First Cause, and the other that passes by secondary causes as something unworthy of the True First Cause; not seeing that the true First Cause makes the world with three orders of being: the lower ministering to the higher and the higher to the lower: an inorganic below an organic realm; and within the organic realm creating the animal below the man, and among the races of man making savages below civilized peoples. It does not see that in all these divine goodness has its own great purpose—to make the world of time and space an infinite cradle

[1] See Goethe's *Faust*, "Scene in Heaven" (Part II, Act V, scene 7), Pater Profundus and Pater Seraphicus.

for the development of spiritual individuality. The Christian God is not an abstract One delighting only in abstract ones, but a Creator delighting in creators—commanding true believers to engage in the eternal work of the First Cause, namely by multiplying his creative and educative work.

Thus from one or another form of impiety of the intellect there arise collisions with the Church from age to age.

A closer and closer definition of the dogma arises out of the struggle.

One of the greatest epochs of struggle in the Church arose in the time of the importation of Arabian pantheism into Spain, and thence into the other parts of Europe by reason of resort of Christian youth to the medical schools established by the Arabs.

The great commentators on Aristotle, Avicenna and Averrhoes, came to notice and caused great anxiety by their interpretation of Aristotle's doctrine of the active Reason (*νοῦς ποιητικός*), which they held to exist only in God; and upon the death of the individual, the passive soul of reason (*νοῦς παθητικός*), which is conceived by them as a temporary manifestation of the active Reason, withdrew and was absorbed into the deity, losing its individual being.

To Christianity the doctrine of individual immortality is vital. Without it the world view of the Church would suffer dissolution.

The publication of the pantheistic version of Aristotle forced Christian scholars to study seriously the Greek philosophy. Piety of the heart and piety of the will did not suffice. Piety of the intellect was needed, and it came in a series of thinkers who wrote the expositions of Christian theology of which the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas is the great exemplar. Piety of the intellect overcame the dangers of religious heresy.

After an epoch of rapid philosophical development—a period of a too exclusive devotion to the piety of the intellect—there came a decadence in the piety of the will and the piety of the heart, and when this began to have its visible effects in the neglect of the secular interests of the Church a reaction set in, which culminated in the triumph of the pestilent doctrine of nominal-

ism through the dialectic skill of William of Occam, and as a consequence the great philosophy of Saint Thomas of Aquino fell into neglect. But this gave an opportunity for the triumph of the study of secondary causes. Natural science began new inventories of nature and new studies of mind which set forth theories almost mechanical in their results.

With nominalism no speculative investigations into the nature of a first cause are permissible. All that is left is an empirical study of things and events—an inventory and a classification; theories of forces; mechanical composition and decomposition of bodies; the transformation of sensations into ideas. Ideas were regarded as of the nature of mere opinions and of less truth than the sensations which furnished the only vivid certainty esteemed to be of real worth.

There is bound to arise a reaction against religious authority whenever the Church itself neglects the exposition of the intellectual insights which are the most vital part of its contribution to civilization. For if the Christian world view is rendered untenable, the piety of the will and the piety of the heart will soon decay.

A series of skeptical reactions not only against the Church but against the authority of the State have taken place, as a result of this movement away from theology and toward an exclusive study of secondary causes.

The German word *Aufklärung*, or clearing-up of the mind, has become more or less familiar to us as including the phases of this revolt against authority.

It holds to the study of secondary causes and the neglect of the First Cause.

There has been only one great *Aufklärung*, the French Revolution, which swept together all the negative tendencies into one movement of destruction to Church and State. But there are numerous, very numerous minor movements. In every department its influence is felt.

In the last half of the nineteenth century Herbert Spencer occupied, and still occupies, much attention. It is interesting to note that in his generalizations of science he adopted the

agnostic view of his system from Hamilton and Mansell. Back of that view is Hume's skepticism, especially with regard to the category of causality, and it would not be difficult to trace his extreme nominalism to the stream of influence that William of Occam set flowing within the Church.

Herbert Spencer's theory of the world resembles in a marked manner the doctrine of the Oriental mind that the world process finally comes to nothing. One after another, things and events appear and then vanish again, and all remains as at first.[1] It is a Sisyphus movement with no permanent outcome and no worthy result. It begins with the homogeneous, undifferentiated condition of matter and moves toward hetero-

[1] "Evolution," says Spencer, in that concise statement of his system found in his *Autobiography*, vol. i, p. 650–652, "Evolution . . . is a movement (6) not simply from homogeneity to heterogeneity, but from an indefinite homogeneity to a definite heterogeneity; and this trait of increasing definiteness, which accompanies the trait of increasing heterogeneity, is, like it, exhibited in the totality of things and in all its divisions and subdivisions down to the minutest. (7) Along with this redistribution of the matter composing an evolving aggregate, there goes on a redistribution of the retained motion of its components in relation to one another; this also becomes, step by step, more definitely heterogeneous. (13) Dissolution is the counter-change which sooner or later every evolved aggregate undergoes. Remaining exposed to surrounding forces that are unequilibriated, each aggregate is ever liable to be dissipated by the increase, gradual or sudden, of its contained motion; and its dissipation, quickly undergone by bodies lately animate, and slowly undergone by inanimate masses, remains to be undergone at an indefinitely remote period by each planetary and stellar mass, which since an indefinitely distant period in the past has been slowly evolving, the cycle of its transformations being thus completed. (14) This rhythm of evolution and dissolution, completing itself during short periods in small aggregates, and in the vast aggregates distributed through space completing itself in periods which are immeasurable by human thought, is, so far as we can see, universal and eternal—each alternating phase of the process predominating, now in this region of space and now in that, as local conditions determine. (16) That which persists, unchanging in quantity but ever changing in form, under these sensible appearances which the Universe presents to us, transcends human knowledge and conception—is an unknown and unknowable Power, which we are obliged to recognize as without limit in space and without beginning or end in time."

geneity, individuality, and complexity of function. Evolution is this process of individualization. But all evolution is to be followed by dissolution, a return to the chaotic and unindividualized state of the homogeneous which Spencer considered to be unstable and, so to speak, impelled to evolution, but which in the end becomes unstable again and seeks its equilibrium in chaos.

One of the chief leaders of the *Aufklärung* has thus returned to Orientalism, and his infinite and eternal is only an unknown and unknowable power—he calls it "unknown and unknowable," though he let us clearly see that there is a shuttle motion produced by it out of chaos into individuality, and from individuality back again into chaos.

A creative goodness which lifts into being an infinity of other selves of animals and men, only to swallow them up again by a jealous reaction, drawing them down into the homogeneous ocean of chaotic matter, deserves rather to be called, as Plato in the *Timæus*, and Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* called it, envy and jealousy (φθόνος), a quality of mind which they thought not possible to find in the idea of God as Creator.

The only effective counter-movement against the *Aufklärung* is the return to a study of the First Cause.

This does not mean the neglect of secondary causes, but their proper adjustment. It is an application of the great results of religious thought—a social institutional kind of thinking that should be gone over by every individual for his enlightenment. The Church should elaborate its application of the thought of the First Cause to all secondary causes, showing in each case how the divine goodness connects and explains the entire movement from the mechanical to the chemical, and from these to the crystal, the plant, the animal, and to man.

I review, in concluding my paper, the line of argument based on the second or causal aspect of experience:

1. The first religious step is taken when all secondary causes are aggregated into one group and included in the world order in what we have called the first pole of experience. Ancestor worship with its infinite series of finite spirits

belongs only to a world order. A true originating causality, a first cause, belongs to a second and higher order, to a self-determining or originating order of being which transcends the world of things and events; all things and events depending upon a being derived from beyond, and not in themselves possessing self-existence; and the true second order possessing independence, self-existence, and the power to produce duality by consciousness, will, or some other form of self-determination.

2. The first thinking of this transcendent being becomes absorbed in the contemplation of its transcendence or sovereignty over the first order. While the first order is dependent and must derive its support, all that it has, from a higher order of being, the second order is independent and can exist by itself. The religious contemplation is absorbed in this fact of independence or transcendence; it searches the origin of the dependent order in the sovereignty of the independent order; but it does not find at first, in the independent, the motive for the dependent. It halts in the thought of transcendence and denies reality to the world of things and events; it becomes pantheism or Orientalism; it denies creatorship in the first principle.

3. The result of the first insight into the presupposition of dependent being has reached an independent being which is devoid of true causality and which does not impart its true being to a derived world; this is pantheism. But, again, this result contradicts the presupposition on which the insight into the second order is based. For unless there is presupposed a true originating causality, a self-determining One, the higher order of being exists only in itself and not for itself; its causality is not real to itself; if its causality produces only a world of phenomenality and illusion, then the result of its causality is only to reveal to the independent being its own inefficiency as a cause; it is a cause which cannot produce anything real, hence it is not a true cause.

4. The history of the religions of Asia is a history of the discovery of the self-contradictions of pantheism—of a true causal being which does not truly cause. It is also a series

of attempted solutions to introduce true causality without destroying the transcendence or sovereignty of the First Cause. For to introduce any finite motive, that is to say, any motive depending upon another underived being, would destroy the perfection of the first original cause and reduce it to a secondary cause and thus throw back the entire investigation to the stage of ancestor worship. The escape from this dilemma, which offers a choice between the destruction of the imperfect world and the destruction of the perfect world, or its renunciation by philosophic thought, is found in the doctrine of the Logos and its complete exposition in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.

5. True causality is the self-revelation of the highest order of being. But it does not in its pure self-determination reach secondary causes. Its action in itself is the revelation of a perfect in a perfect; this is the doctrine of the Logos. Perfect self-determination results in perfect revelation in another; an eternal object becomes an eternal subject whose thinking and willing are one, and hence goodness and righteousness. Through this thought it is explained how the primary causality in the Logos becomes secondary causality through the contemplation of goodness and righteousness as the inner essence of causality.

6. The Christian view of the world, therefore, does not compromise its idea of the transcendency or sovereignty of the First Cause, but preserves it perfectly and at the same time introduces transcendency into the world order by the doctrine of the immortality, freedom, and responsibility of the human soul, who through religious insight interprets the entire world order as a process of creation and salvation; the process of creating souls with independent individuality and infinite powers of self-development in will and intellect, in goodness and righteousness. Consciousness proceeds through science and philosophy and theology everlastingly toward a completer comprehension of the divine method of creation of real being, that is to say, of moral beings through the inorganic and the organic processes in time and space and through the discipline of moral beings by means of their historic experience of life.

This development of consciousness makes possible the co-operation of the human will with the divine will. This is the ultimate cause presupposed by secondary causation. It is the second aspect of experience.

7. This view of the world elevates it into the highest significance, not through its secondary causes, but through its first cause as the divine self-activity in its goodness and righteousness. It is infinite grace.

8. This view of the world makes secondary causes significant in the light of the First Cause. It makes the history of nature thus interpreted a part of the book of divine revelation.

9. With the pantheistic interpretation, the divine purpose disappears from the realm of secondary causes, and with this there vanishes all true causality and high significance to science. For the objects of science, namely, material nature and human history, when separated from the divine and devoid of a share in the causal activity of a transcendent being who is a real cause, become a chaos of illusion, the East Indian Maya.

10. In the ruder forms of religion, the varieties of ancestor worship and fetichism, science has no place, because all secondary causes become capricious activities of spiritual beings not subordinated to a first principle of goodness and righteousness.

11. It follows from these considerations that social culture in the form of the Church and the School as independent institutions becomes possible only on the basis of the religious world view of Christianity; and that the perennial continuance of the world view of Christianity through the special form of social culture which belongs to the Church is a necessary condition presupposed bv the forms of social culture intrusted to the School.

XXXVI

THE MYSTERIES

"WHAT HAS PSYCHICAL RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHED?"

BY

WILLIAM F. BARRETT

PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

WE approach the borderland of fainter knowledge. Religion has always had Superstition as a handmaid, and, following somewhere in her train, come vaguer, immaterial things, magic and mystery, half-hinted communications with an unseen world, the immaterial made manifest and visible in matter. There was a day not over long ago when we thought we could afford to laugh at all these "manifestations," when most of us took our ground in fancied security on the assertion that all matter and all life were subject solely to material laws, that spiritualism was to be classed with the ghost stories of our childhood, that thought transferrence was on a par with "sleight-of-hand" performances upon the stage, and that mesmerism was but another name for fraud. In brief, the "influence of mind on matter" was dismissed as an empty form of words, a figure of speech wholly dissociate from physical fact. That day has gone by. There is something behind all these studies of the occult, something toward which earnest scientific investigation is dimly reaching. Perhaps that weird "subconscious self" of which we grow dimly aware is becoming more developed, more positively assertive. Perhaps that extra "sixth sense," of which our poets have dreamed and prophesied, begins to stir within us. Such suggestions, of course, are still but fantasies, yet there is something underlying them, something as yet inexplicable, but

inexorable, inevitable. Science no longer laughs at psychical research, nor can any intelligent man afford to do so. Rather must we hold ourselves alert, receptive, eager to seize upon and welcome the kernel of truth when it can at last be separated from the husk of falsehood and deception in which it has been too long enwrapped. What has so far been done to separate husk and kernel is here pointed out for us by Professor Barrett, former President of the English "Society for Psychical Research." Mr. Barrett is no amateur investigator, but a leading educator of distinguished reputation, Professor of Physics in the Royal College of Science, Dublin.

I AM sometimes asked what our Society has already achieved, what it has done to justify its existence? The reply to this is found in the eighteen closely printed volumes of our *Proceedings*, and the eleven volumes of our *Journal*, containing an immense mass of evidence, the record of carefully sifted observations or of stringent experiments. These form a storehouse of material which we have every reason to believe will become increasingly valuable to students of both psychology and philosophy in the not distant future. Unquestionably a change of opinion is gradually coming about through the work of our Society. The widespread and unreasoning prejudice which 25 years ago existed against all psychical inquiry is breaking down. This is seen in the list of distinguished men who have become members of our Society, and here I desire to welcome one of our great English savants, a man of European reputation, who has recently joined our ranks, and this coincidently with his election to the high position of joint honorary secretary to the Royal Society.

But although there is a more open mind on the part of science toward psychical research, it must be confessed it is still looked at somewhat askance by the leaders and organs of official science. It is worth a moment's attention to consider why this should be. No one asserts that the knowledge we are seeking to obtain is unimportant, for, as the learned Dr. Glanville said 200 years ago about similar subjects to those we are studying: "These things relate to our biggest interests; if established,

they secure some of the outworks of religion." Nor, so far as I know, does any one assert we are hasty and incautious, or unscientific in our method of investigation. No doubt one reason for the present attitude of official science toward us has been the prevalence and paralyzing influence of a materialistic philosophy, which denies the possibility of mind without a material brain, or of any means of access from other minds to our mind except through the recognized channels of sensation. Both these propositions are of course denied by our religious teachers, who assert that a spiritual world does exist, and that the inspired writings were given supersensuously to man. Nevertheless, as a body, though with some notable exceptions, even *they* do not welcome us with open arms. The common ground and official view of both science and religion are that all extension to our existing knowledge in their respective departments can only come through the channels recognized by each; in the one case the channel is bounded by the five senses, and in the other case it is that sanctioned by authority. We must all admit that even unconsciously authority has a large share in moulding our convictions and determining our conduct; in fact, we cannot emancipate ourselves from its subtle influence. As a rule this is beneficial, unless it can be shown that authority is untrustworthy ; but the attempt to prove that it is so is sure to be an ungracious and difficult task, and almost certain to bring odium to bear upon those who, if they eventually prove to be right, are in a subsequent generation hailed as benefactors of the race.

Some years ago that most learned man, the late Professor von Helmholtz, visited Dublin. I had then recently published a paper, giving for the first time *prima facie* evidence of something new to science, called thought transferrence, now known as telepathy. Helmholtz, who was a great physiologist as well as physicist, had some conversation with me on the subject, and he ended by saying: "I cannot believe it. Neither the testimony of all the Fellows of the Royal Society, nor even the evidence of my own senses, would lead me to believe in the transmission of thought from one person to another independently of the recognized channels of sensation. It is clearly

impossible." The respect that is due to so great a man renders it necessary to show in a few words why this statement (one that used to be common enough) is wholly indefensible. First, the phenomena in question, and all the phenomena within the scope of our Society, are not contradictions, but merely extensions of our existing knowledge; they may be strange and inexplicable, but that merely indicates that the evidence in support of the new facts must be recognized as adequate. As Laplace long ago said in his "Theory of Probabilities": "We are so far from knowing all the agents of nature, and their various modes of action, that it would not be philosophical to deny any phenomena merely because in the actual state of our knowledge they are inexplicable. This only ought we to do—in proportion to the difficulty there seems to be in admitting the facts, should be the scrupulous attention we bestow on their examination."[1] That this is the true spirit may be seen from the recent discoveries in connection with radium. These facts appeared even to contradict some of our previous knowledge. We always thought of an atom, as Lucretius did, "strong in solid singleness," as the most immutable and immortal thing in the physical universe. Now it appears to be capable of disintegration and transmutation, and the views of the alchemists are beginning to revive: soon we may be looking for the "philosopher's stone"—the substance that by its presence enables the transmutation of other heavy atoms to come about. Thus does the whirligig of time bring its revenges.

But to return. There is another fallacy in the scientific view expressed by Helmholtz. He said, as many do, that nothing could make him believe in such phenomena. But belief is not a voluntary act of the mind, it cannot be given or withheld at pleasure; it is, obviously, an involuntary state, which follows if our judgment considers the evidence adduced adequate and conclusive. We can, of course, as many do, refuse to listen to the evidence; and it is worth noticing that in all our minds there is a tendency to repel the intrusion of any ideas unrelated to our usual habits of thought and which therefore involve an uncomfortable dislocation of our mind: so that attention to evidence

[1] Laplace, *Théorie analytique des Probabilités*, Introd., p. 43.

of this character is a difficult act of self-conquest. Hence every new departure in thought has to encounter great aberrations of mind. But when attention is given, and the evidence considered adequate, it is sheer nonsense to say you won't believe it.

Is there any other ground why science should not ungrudgingly recognize the evidence so amply given in our *Proceedings?* I have recently made inquiries among some of my scientific friends who stand aloof from us, to know what is their reason for so doing. Of course life is short, the claim of each particular branch of scientific investigation becomes increasingly exacting, and but few have time to consider the evidence. This is obvious, but why do they shrug their shoulders when you mention, say, telepathy, or the faculty of dousing? Their attitude reminds me of an anecdote told by that remarkable woman, Miss Caroline Fox, and which I think is mentioned in the memorials of her life. The charming residence of Miss Fox in Cornwall was the meeting ground of many famous men of the last generation. On one occasion that great Irishman, Sir W. Rowan Hamilton, there met Sir G. Airy, then Astronomer-Royal. Hamilton had just published his famous mathematical discovery of quaternions, and was, I believe, explaining it to Airy. After a short time Airy said, "I cannot see it at all." Hamilton replied, "I have been investigating the matter closely for many months, and I am certain of its truth." "Oh," rejoined Airy, "I have been thinking over it for the last two or three minutes, and there is nothing in it." This is why some of our scientific friends shrug their shoulders at our researches. They feel competent, after a few minutes' consideration, to reject conclusions which may have cost us years of investigation.

In fact, nine-tenths of the positive opinions we are accustomed to hear about psychical research are given judicially. That is, the objector speaks of his conclusions as positively as if it were his office to know the truth, and implies that any opposition is a thing for *him* to judge of. "He is annihilated," as Professor De Morgan pointed out some time ago, "by being reduced, no matter how courteously, from judge to counsel.

But this is what must be done. The jurisdiction must be denied. The great art is not to pull him off the bench without ceremony, but to pull the bench from under him, without his exactly seeing how he came to tumble, and without proceeding to sit upon it yourself."

Inquiry among my scientific friends has shown me that the root of much, perhaps most, of the scientific skepticism toward our work is not because the phenomena are startling or inexplicable, but because they cannot be repeated at pleasure; hence so very few scientific men have the opportunity of verifying the observations some of us have made. They do not doubt our good faith, but they think we may have been mistaken in our conclusions, and until we can reproduce the phenomena before them they feel justified in distrusting our results. This might well give ground for suspense of judgment, but surely not for any hostile attitude. It is, of course, most desirable to be able to repeat our experiments at pleasure, but the very nature of our inquiry precludes this. We do not refuse to believe in the fall of meteoric stones unless we can see one falling. We may require a good deal of well-attested evidence for their fall, but once the fact is established the stringency of the evidence demanded immediately relaxes. Now, unquestionably there are at present more capable witnesses who can speak from personal and careful inquiry as to the fact of telepathy, or of what is called spiritualistic phenomena, than there are persons living who can testify to having seen the actual fall from space of meteoric stones.

The fact is, our scientific friends do not realize the profound difference that exists between the conditions of a physical and of a psychical experiment. We know what conditions are requisite in the former case, we do not know what they are in the latter, and hence the difficulty of all psychical investigation and the uncertainty of the reproduction of any given phenomenon.

A moment's consideration shows that the demand made upon us by science for the demonstration at any moment of a particular psychical phenomenon is inconsistent with the very

object of our inquiry. Psychical experiments depend on the mental state of the subject; you may tell a person to do something, but whether he does it or not depends on the person addressed. Physical experiments are independent of our volition; a magnet attracts iron, or sets itself in the magnetic meridian, irrespective of our mental condition. This obvious difference between the two sets of phenomena is constantly overlooked. Physical science excludes from its survey the element of personality, with which we have to deal and over which we have little or no control. It regards all phenomena as strictly impersonal, and finds abundant field for investigation within the narrow limits it has marked out for itself: these things it regards as real, the rest as shadowy. The truth is, of course, exactly the reverse. The reality of which we are conscious is our self, our personality. It is the phenomena of external nature which are shadowy; shadows cast by some reality of which our senses tell us absolutely nothing.

There is, however, no reason why the methods so successfully pursued by science should not also be pursued in the study of the complex and shifting phenomena of human personality. Now, this is precisely the object of our Society—the accurate investigation of that wide range of obscure but wonderful powers included within the mysterious thing we call our self. Albeit we are but at the beginning of a task so vast that it may, in time to come, make all the discoveries of physical science seem trivial, all its labors seem insignificant in comparison with the stupendous problems that are before us.

We need, therefore, much more experimental evidence in every department of our work. So long ago as 1876, in a paper read before the British Association in that year, I stated that before science could attack with any hope of success the investigation of alleged spiritualistic phenomena, we must know whether definite ideas can unconsciously be communicated from one person to another: whether such a thing as thought transferrence does really exist. Evidence was adduced in favor of this hypothesis. We have done much since then, but much remains to be done before telepathy can take its place as an accepted axiom of scientific knowledge.

There is one question in regard to telepathy and similar psychical phenomena which is likely to remain an outstanding difficulty. By what process can one mind affect another at a distance? Physical science teaches us that there is no such thing as "action at a distance." Energy at a distance reaches us either by the translation of matter through space, like a flying bullet, which carries the energy; or by the intermediary action of some medium, like the transmission of sound-bearing waves through the air, or of luminiferous waves through the ether, the energy being handed on from wave to wave. We may talk of brain waves, but that is only unscientific talk; we know of nothing of the kind. Neither do we know how gravitation acts across space: by what means such tremendous forces as bind the solar system together are either exerted or transmitted we know absolutely nothing. We don't talk of gravitation waves, we wait for further knowledge on this mysterious problem; and in like manner we must patiently wait for more light on the mode of transmission of thought through space. It may well be that thought transcends both matter and space, and has no relation to either; that mass, space, and time may only be but the mental symbols we form of our present material system, and have no ultimate reality in themselves.

Another question is as follows: May not the uncertainty and difficulty of our experiments in thought transferrence partly arise from the fact that we are not going to work the right way? We try to obtain evidence of the transmission of a word or idea through some conscious and voluntary act on the part of the percipient. We wait for a verbal or written response. Is not this a mistake? Ought we not rather to seek for evidence of thought transferrence in the region of the subconscious life? I believe in the case of both agent and percipient the conscious will plays only a secondary part. This is also true, I think, in all cases of suggestion, and of the therapeutic effect of suggestion. It is notably seen in the cures wrought by what is known as Christian Science. I happen to have had occasion to study these somewhat carefully of late, and undoubtedly remarkable cures are effected, it may be by suggestion, but without the usual suggestive treatment; the only formula is the

"Allness of God" and the "non-existence of disease." But the healing processes are set going by a purely subconscious act. And so in telepathy, we need to hand over the whole matter to the subliminal activities. The difficulty is how to do this. Hypnosis is one way. And in the ordinary waking state the agent, who makes the suggestion or transmits the idea, would, I believe, do so more effectively if, after the intention had soaked into his mind, he left it alone, so far as any conscious effort was concerned. And the percipient should be as passive as possible, make no effort to guess the word, but allow the perception to reveal itself through some involuntary action. Automatic writing would be the most effective, but that is not very common; the twisting of the forked dousing twig might be utilized, indicating the letters of the alphabet by its motion; or in other ways. In the historical researches I have made on the so-called divining rod, I found it was used in this very manner two centuries ago. In fact what we need to learn is the language of the subliminal life, how it speaks to us, how we can speak to it. The voluntary action of the muscles in speech or gesture is the language of our conscious life; the involuntary action of our muscles, and emotional disturbance, appear to be the language of the subconscious life.

Then another point should be noticed, the frequent lagging of the impression in the percipient. I observed this again and again in my first experiments in thought transferrence twenty-five years ago. The correct reply to a previous experiment would sometimes come in answer to a later and different experiment. I have noticed the same thing also in dousing; with some dousers the motion of the twig lags behind the moment of the impression; it turns after the douser has passed a little beyond the right spot. We have precisely similar phenomena in physical science. The magnetic state of iron lags a little behind the magnetizing force it is subjected to; this is known as *hysteresis*, from a Greek word signifying to lag behind. So I believe there is a psychical as well as a physical hysteresis, and if so, it should be reckoned with in our experiments. It is improbable that any psychical action, even of telepathy, occurs without some preceding change in the nerve tissues; in technical phrase-

ology, neurosis must always precede psychosis; and then this change must rise till it is of sufficient magnitude to create the reflex that moves the muscles. And all this involves time, which may be greater or less, and so account for the occasional lag we observe.

Other questions suggest themselves. Is it the idea or the word, the motion or the expression of the emotion, that is transmitted in telepathy? Probably the idea. If so, it affords a hint toward the interchange of thought among the race in spite of differences of language. Language is but a clumsy instrument of thought, and quite incommensurate to it; its arbitrary signs show it to be but the rudiments of a system which the evolutionary progress of the race may lead us to hope will be more perfect in the future. How much more accurately should we be able to transmit complex ideas and subtle emotions if thought could evoke thought without the mechanism of speech. This may now be the case in the state of life in the unseen. The sanctity and privacy of our minds will, however, require to be protected from unwelcome intrusion, and this, so far as our conscious life is concerned, will doubtless be within our own power to effect, so long as we retain control over our selfhood, our true personality.[1]

Then, again, may not animals share with man this telepathic power? They have in some directions keener perceptive faculties than man, and there is evidence that they are strongly affected by what we call apparitions. It may be that animals, and insects like the ant and the bee, do communicate with each other by some process analogous to telepathy. It is worth trying to find out whether, say, a favorite dog can respond to a telepathic impact from his master. In centuries to come it is just possible that through some such interchange of feelings we may get into closer communion with all sentient things.

There is one argument in favor of the existence of something analogous to thought transferrence, which—so far as I

[1] In that remarkable book published some seventy years ago, Isaac Taylor's *Physical Theory of Another Life* (chap. viii.), will be found a prevision of telepathy and of some of the ideas contained in the foregoing paragraph.

know—has not been used, and it is, I think, a legitimate argument, for it is based upon the underlying unity that exists throughout Nature. The theory of gravitation teaches us that every grain of sand on every seashore in this world, every particle of salt in every salt cellar, is forever pulling every grain of sand or salt, not only on this earth, but on every planet, or star, in the whole universe. And *vice versa*, for there is a reciprocal influence ever going on between these myriads of remote things. Nay, more, such is the solidarity of the universe that an interchange of radiation, as well of attraction, is ever taking place between things on this earth, and also between our planet and every member of the solar system. No fact in physical science is more certain than this. May not this "theory of exchanges," this mobile equilibrium, extend to the psychical as well as the physical universe? Tennyson, with poetic prescience, asks in "Aylmer's Field":

> "Star to star vibrates light, may soul to soul
> Strike through a finer element of her own?"

Certainly it seems very probable that every centre of consciousness is likely to react telepathically upon every other centre.[1]

[1] Since this address was delivered my attention has been drawn to Mrs. Browning's striking sonnet on "Life," wherein the same idea is elaborated: poets are certainly wonderful pioneers of thought. Before telepathy was thought of, Mrs. Browning wrote:

> "Each creature holds an insular point in space;
> Yet what man stirs a finger, breathes a sound,
> But all the multitudinous beings round
> In all the countless worlds, with time and place
> For their conditions, down to the central base,
> Thrill, haply, in vibration and rebound,
> Life answering life across the vast profound,
> In full antiphony, by a common grace?
> I think this sudden joyaunce which illumes
> A child's mouth sleeping, unaware may run
> From some soul newly loosened from earth's tombs;
> I think this passionate sigh, which half begun
> I stifle back, may reach and stir the plumes
> Of God's calm angel standing in the sun."

It is hard to believe that the play of vital forces should be more restricted than that of the physical forces; that radio-activities should be confined to inanimate matter. If this unconscious radiation and reaction is going on between mind and mind, then observed cases of telepathy would simply mean the awakening of consciousness to the fact in certain minds. Why some and not all minds, and why so fitfully the conscious perception should be aroused, are problems we must leave to the future; they are quite consistent with what we find everywhere in nature. For my own part, I am disposed to think this interchange is common to the race, and is the chief reason why all men are insensibly moulded by their environment. Only, as I said just now, I believe the telepathic exchange emanates from and effects the subconscious part of our personality. It is potentially conscious, and may, and probably will eventually, become an integral part of our self-consciousness.

We know as a matter of fact that a vast number of impressions are constantly being made upon us, of which we take no heed; they do not interest us, or they are not strong enough to arouse consciousness. But the impressions are there, they leave a mark upon us, though we are not aware of it, and they may float to the surface, or be evoked at some future time. One of the most certain and striking results of the investigations made by our Society is that the content of our subconscious life is far greater than that of our conscious life. Our minds are like a photographic plate, sensitive to all sorts of impressions, but our ego develops only a few of these impressions; these are our conscious perceptions, the rest are latent, awaiting development, which may come in sleep, hynopsis, or trance, or by the shock of death, or after death.

But even here and now this subconscious radio-activity of thought may already play some part in the growing sense of sympathy and humanity we find in the race. And what a change would be wrought if it were suddenly to become an element of consciousness among mankind. To realize the brotherhood of the race would not then be a pious aspiration or a strenuous effort, but *the* reality of all others most vividly before us; involuntary sharers in one another's pleasures and

pains, the welfare of our fellow-men would be *the* factor in our lives which would dominate all our conduct. What would be the use of a luxurious club and Parisian cooks if the privation and suffering of the destitute were telepathically part and parcel of our lives? Slowly the race does seem to be awakening to the sense of a larger self, which embraces the many in the One, to

> "A heart that beats
> In all its pulses with the common heart
> Of humankind, which the same things make glad,
> The same make sorry."

The instinct of true religion, like the insight of the true poet, arrives at some great verity without the process of reasoning or the need of proof. Thus it has been with the belief in prayer and in the efficacy of prayer. Skepticism scoffs at a mystery which involves the direct action of mind on mind and the still greater mystery of the movement of the Infinite by the finite—but faith remains unshaken. For us wayfaring men, however, reason needs some help in climbing the steeps attained by faith. And is not this help afforded by the steps slowly being cut in the upward path by means of psychical research? What is telepathy but the proof of the reasonableness of prayer? No longer need our reason rest content with the plausible explanation that prayer can do no more than evoke a subjective response in the suppliant; that it is unconceivable how the Infinite and the finite mind, the One manifest in the many, can have any community of thought. On the contrary, if telepathy be indisputable, if our creaturely minds can, without voice or sensation, impress each other, the Infinite mind is likely thus to have revealed itself in all ages to responsive human hearts. Some may have the spiritual ear, the open vision, but to all of us there comes at times the echo of that larger life which is slowly expressing itself in humanity as the ages gradually unfold. In fact the teaching of science has ever been that we are not isolated in, or from, the great cosmos; the light of suns and stars reaches us, the mysterious force of gravitation binds the whole material universe into an organic whole, the minutest

molecule and the most distant orb are bathed in one and the self-same medium. But surely beyond and above all these material links is the solidarity of mind. As the essential significance and unity of a honeycomb are not in the cells of wax, but in the common life and purpose of the builders of those cells, so the true significance of nature is not in the material world, but in the mind that gives to it a meaning, and that underlies and unites, that transcends and creates, the phenomenal world through which for a moment each of us is passing. "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are unseen are eternal."

I will now turn for a few minutes to another branch of our researches, which has special interest for me, as it was this subject that first aroused my interest in experimental psychology, and to which I gave many months of experimenting long before our Society was founded. I refer to hypnotism.

There are no doubt many present who remember the outcry that was once raised against the investigation of hypnotism, then called mesmerism. Constant attacks were made by the medical and scientific world on the one hand, and by the religious world on the other, upon the early workers at this subject. They were denounced as impostors, shunned as pariahs, and unceremoniously pitched out of the synagogues of both science and religion; and this within my own memory. Physiological and medical science can only hang its head in shame when it looks back upon that period. What do we find to-day—the subject of hypnotism and its therapeutic value recognized! It has now become an integral part of scientific teaching and investigation in several medical schools, more especially on the Continent. I think our Society may fairly lay claim to have contributed to this change of view, and the work of our members, Edmund Gurney, and Drs. Arthur Myers, Milne Bramwell, and Lloyd Tuckey, has added much to the knowledge of a subject the importance of which it is difficult to overrate. It is also worthy of note how the former neglect on this subject by science relegated it to the ignorant and the charlatan, and its practice to mysterious and often mischievous public amusements. These are now less common; and though the public apprehen-

sion of the dangerous abuse of hypnotism is grossly exaggerated, for it is less open to abuse than chloroform, I, for one, am strongly of opinion that we, as a Society, should discourage, and (as in many Continental countries) get the legislature to forbid, the practice of hypnotism except under proper medical supervision.

Now, I think it is the duty of our Society to cherish the memory of these courageous seekers after truth, who were the pioneers in this and other branches of psychical research. The splendid and self-sacrificing labors of those distinguished physicians, Drs. Elliotson and Esdaile, in the fields of hypnotic therapeutics and painless surgery under hypnosis, should never be forgotten, any more than the later work of Dr. Braid of Manchester. Dr. Elliotson, though at the head of his profession, sacrificed everything for the advancement of this branch of knowledge. The mesmeric hospital in London, and the similar hospital founded in Calcutta by an enlightened Governor-General and placed under the care of Dr. Esdaile, did remarkable work, too little known at the present day. I am therefore glad to see in Dr. Milne Bramwell's *magnum opus* on hypnotism that he draws special attention to the labors of Elliotson, Esdaile, and Braid. And it is to be regretted how completely these pioneers are ignored in the works on suggestive therapeutics by Dr. Bernheim, Dr. Liébeault, Dr. Schofield, and some others.

Leaving this part of our subject, now within the purview of science, let us pass to the extreme or advanced wing of psychical research; to that part of our work on which considerable differences of opinion exist even within our Society. I refer to spiritualistic phenomena. With regard to these we must all agree that indiscriminate condemnation on the one hand, and ignorant credulity on the other, are the two most mischievous elements with which we are confronted in connection with this subject. It is because we, as a Society, feel that in the fearless pursuit of truth it is the paramount duty of science to lead the way, that the scornful attitude of the scientific world toward even the investigation of these phenomena is so

much to be deprecated. Hence, as in the case of those who were pioneers in the study of hypnotism, we ought not to forget the small band of investigators who before our time had the courage, after patient inquiry, to announce their belief in what, for want of any better theory, they called spiritualistic phenomena. No doubt we can pick holes in their method of investigation, but they were just as honest, just as earnest seekers after truth, as we claim to be, and they deserve more credit than we can lay claim to, for they had to encounter greater opposition and vituperation. The superior person then, as now, smiled at the credulity of those better informed than himself. I suppose we are all apt to fancy our own power of discernment and of sound judgment to be somewhat better than our neighbors'. But, after all, is it not the common sense, the care, the patience, and the amount of uninterrupted attention we bestow upon any psychical phenomena we are investigating that give value to the opinion at which we arrive, and not the particular cleverness or skepticism of the observer? The lesson we all need to learn is that what even the humblest of men *affirm* from their own experience is always worth listening to, but what even the cleverest of men, in their ignorance, *deny* is never worth a moment's attention.

The acute and powerful intellect of Professor De Morgan, the great exposer of scientific humbug, long ago said, and he had the courage publicly to state, that however much the Spiritualists might be ridiculed, they were undoubtedly on the track that has led to all advancement in knowledge, for they had the spirit and method of the old times, when paths had to be cut through the uncleared forests in which we can now easily walk.[1] Their *spirit* was that of universal examination unchecked by the fear of being detected in the investigation of nonsense. This was the spirit that animated the Florentine Academicians and the first Fellows of the Royal Society two hundred and fifty years ago; they set to work to prove all things that they might hold fast to that which was good. And their *method* was that of all scientific research, viz., to start a theory and see how it

[1] See Preface of *From Matter to Spirit*, p. xviii.

worked. Without a theory "facts are a mob, not an army." Meteorology at the present moment is buried under a vast mob of observations for want of ingenuity in devising theories; *any* working hypothesis is better than none at all. And so I agree with De Morgan that the most sane and scientific method in psychical research is not to be afraid of propounding a theory because it may seem extraordinary, but to have courage to do so and see if it works. The theory of thought transferrence led to the accumulation of evidence which bids fair, sooner or later, to place telepathy among the established truths of science.

The amusing feature in the progress of knowledge is that, usually, critics who resist as long as they can a new theory are apt afterwards, when the theory becomes widely accepted, to use it indiscriminately, as if it covered all obscure phenomena; and so it becomes a kind of fetich in their thoughts. We are all familiar with the imposture theory, with the coincidence theory, and with the telepathic theory; each excellent in its way, but most foolish and unscientific if we allow any one of them to obscure our vision or paralyze our investigation. What is to be reprobated, as De Morgan said, "is not the wariness which widens and lengthens inquiry, but the *assumption* which prevents and narrows it."

Instances are well known of the most acute and careful inquirers, trained physical detectives we might call them, who having begun with *a priori* reasoning and resolute skepticism, when they have thrown aside their preconceived assumptions, and given the necessary time and patience to the investigation of one particular case, have gone over to the spiritualistic camp. They may be right or wrong in their present opinion, but we must all admit they have far better reasons for forming a judgment than any of us can have. If they are right, it follows that the particular case they have investigated is not likely to be a solitary one, but typical of similar cases with us as well as with them.

Pray do not suppose I hold a brief on behalf of spiritualism either as a practice or as a religion. On the contrary, to my mind, few things are more dismal than the common run of spiritualistic séances. Sometimes they revolt one's feelings,

and always they are a weariness to the flesh. Perhaps the manifold experiences I have had have been unfortunate, and I freely admit my remarks apply more particularly to sittings with professional mediums, where what are called physical manifestations take place, which always seem to be on a lower plane, even where the possibility of fraud has been carefully excluded. Nevertheless, if we can get at truth, what does it matter whether we draw it from a well or drag it from a bog?

It is impossible, however, not to feel some sympathy with the common objection of the doubter that the phenomena are of so paltry a character. But we cannot prescribe to nature, we cannot get rid of the leprosy of doubt by choosing rivers of our own to wash in. And so we must be content with what we find. After all, from a scientific point of view, nothing can be paltry or mean that manifests life.

Bacteriologists spend their days searching for evidence of the lowest forms of life. And surely any evidence of personality that gives us the faintest, rudest sign that life still persists, though the clothing of the body be gone, is worth infinite trouble to attain. Though it may be

> "Only a signal shown and a voice from out of the darkness,"

it is not paltry. In fine, it is this natural human longing that renders a dispassionate consideration of the facts, a calm and critical weighing of the evidence, so difficult and yet so imperative.

We must, however, bear in mind, as was pointed out by the present Prime Minister, in the remarkable address he delivered from this chair, that if science had first attempted to include in its survey not only physical but psychical phenomena it might for centuries have lost itself in dark and difficult regions, and the work of science to-day would then have been less, not more complete.[1] This is very true; the foundations of our faith in the undeviating order of nature had to be laid by the investigation of the laws of matter and motion and by the

[1] *Proceedings S. P. R.*, Vol. X., p. 5.

discovery of the orderly evolution of life. What science has now established is that the universe is a cosmos, not a chaos, that amidst the mutability of all things there is no capriciousness, no disorder; that in the interpretation of nature, however entangled or obscure the phenomena may be, we shall never be put to intellectual confusion.

Now, if instead of investigating the normal phenomena of the world in which we live, science had first grappled with supernormal phenomena, it would not have reached so soon its present assured belief in a reign of law. We believe that fuller knowledge of the obscure phenomena we are investigating will in time come to us, as it has in other branches of science, but the appearances are so elusive, the causes so complex, the result of the work sometimes so disheartening, that we need the steadying influence of the habit of thought engendered by science to enable us patiently and hopefully to pursue our way.

Possibly historical research among the most ancient records may give us fragments of unsuspected information; for it is very probable that many, if not all, the psychical phenomena we are now investigating were known, and the knowledge jealously guarded, in ages long past. The very high civilization which is now known to have existed thousands of years before Christ in the earliest Egyptian dynasties makes it almost inconceivable to imagine that subjects of such transcendent interest to mankind were not then part of the learning of the few, part of "the wisdom of Egypt." The seizure of this knowledge by the priestly caste and its restriction to themselves, with penalties to all intruders, were the natural sequence of the lower civilization that followed. Thus psychical phenomena became veiled in mystery, and ultimately degraded to a mischievous superstition. Mystic rites were added to impress the multitude; finally divination, enchantment, augury, and necromancy became methods of wielding a mysterious power held by the few. But such practices "wearied the people's intellect, destroyed their enterprise, and distorted their conscience."[1] The

[1] Prof. G. A. Smith in his brilliant and scholarly work on Isaiah, Vol. II., p. 199.

industry and politics of the people became paralyzed by giving heed to an oracle, or to gibbering spirits, rather than to reason and strenuous endeavor. The great Hebrew prophets, the statesmen of their day, saw this clearly and had the courage to denounce such practices in unmistakable terms; warning the people that by using these things as an infallible guide, or as a religion, they were being misled and reason was being dethroned from her seat. And so the burden of their speech was, "Thy spells and enchantments with which thou hast wearied thyself have led thee astray."[1] Hence these practices were prohibited, as a careful study of the whole subject shows, because they enervated the nation, and tended to obscure the Divine idea: to weaken the supreme faith in, and reverent worship of, the one omnipotent Being the Hebrew nation was set apart to proclaim. With no assured knowledge of the great world order we now possess, these elusive occult phenomena confused both the intellectual and moral sense, and so they were wisely thrust aside. But the danger at the present day is very different. Instead of a universe peopled with unseen personalities, the science of to-day has gone to the other extreme, and, as Mr. Myers once eloquently said, we are now taught to believe "the universe to be a soulless interaction of atoms, and life a paltry misery closed in the grave." Were the Hebrew prophets now among us, surely their voice would not be raised in condemnation of the attempts we are making to show that the order of nature contains an even vaster procession of phenomena than are now embraced within the limits of recognized science, and that behind the appearances with which science deals there are more enduring and transcendent realities.

I have ventured upon this digression in the hope that I may remove the misgivings with which a part of our work is regarded by some leaders of religious opinion, who from time to time have been in communication with me. Perhaps I may also add that the aversion which some feel toward any inquiry

[1] *Cf.* latter half of Isaiah, ch. xlvii.

into spiritualistic phenomena arises, I think, from a misapprehension. With what is spiritual, with religion, these phenomena have nothing in common. They may afford us a rational belief in the existence of life without a visible body, of thought without material protoplasm, and so become the handmaid of faith. But they belong to a wholly different order from that of religious faith. Our concern is solely with the evidence for certain *phenomena;* and as Prof. Karl Pearson has said, "Whenever there is the slightest possibility for the mind of men to know, there is a legitimate problem for science." Hence all appearances, whether of microbes or of men, are legitimate subjects of investigation. Because they happen to be fitful, or phenomena occurring in an unseen environment, does not render the investigation improper or unscientific, though it makes it considerably more difficult.

Now the investigations we have published undeniably establish the fact that human personality embraces a far larger scope than science has hitherto recognized. That it partakes of a two-fold life, on one side a self-consciousness which is awakened by and related to time and space, to sense and outward things; on the other side a deeper, slumbering, but potential consciousness, the record of every unheeded past impression, possessing higher receptive and perceptive powers than our normal self-consciousness, a self that, I believe, links our individual life to the ocean of life and to the Source of all life. It is a remarkable fact that long ago the philosopher Kant instinctively stated the same truth. He says: "[It is possible that] the human soul even in this life stands in indissoluble community with all immaterial natures of the spirit world, it mutually acts upon them and receives from them impressions, of which, however, as man, it is unconscious as long as all goes well."[1] This, of

[1] "Es wird künftig, ich weiss nicht wo oder wann, noch bewiesen werden, dass die menschliche Seele auch in diesem Leben in einer unauflöslich verknüpften Gemeinschaft mit allen immateriellen Naturen der Geisterwelt stehe, dass sie wechselweise in diese wirke und von ihnen Eindrücke empfange, deren sie sich als Mensch nicht bewusst ist, so lange alles wohl steht." (Kant's *Sämmtliche Werke*, Hartenstein's Edition, 1867, Vol. II., p. 341.

course, was Swedenborg's view. He tells us, "Man is so constituted that he is at the *same time* in the spiritual world and in the natural world." Plotinus, who lived in the third century, held a similar belief; this was in fact the view of the Neo-Platonists and of the later mystics generally.[1] In connection with this subject may I commend to you the perusal of Dr. Du Prel's "Philosophy of Mysticism," which has been translated with loving labor by one of the earliest and best friends of our Society, Mr. C. C. Massey; perhaps the most valuable part of the work being the suggestive introduction which Mr. Massey himself has added.[2]

There is one interesting point in connection with spiritualistic phenomena which is worth a little attention. As we are all aware, the production of these phenomena appears to be inseparably connected with some special person whom we call "mediumistic." This fact affords perennial amusement to the man in the street. But from a purely scientific standpoint there is nothing remarkable in this. Recent discoveries have revealed the fact that a comparatively few substances possess what is called radio-active power. Unlike ordinary forms of matter, these radio-active bodies possess an inherent and peculiar structure of their own. There is therefore nothing absurd in supposing that there may be a comparatively few persons who have a peculiar and remarkable mental structure, differing from the rest of mankind. Moreover, the pathologist or alienist does not refuse to investigate epilepsy or monomania because restricted to a limited number of human beings.

Furthermore, physical science gives us abundant analogies of the necessity of some intermediary between the unseen and the

[1] Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics*, Vol. I., contains an excellent summary of the views of the Neo-Platonists. Philo Judæus, writing from Alexandria a few years B. C., says: "This alliance with an upper world, of which we are conscious, would be impossible, were not the soul of man an indivisible portion of the divine and blessed spirit." See also Thomas Taylor's translation of some of the works of Plotinus.

[2] Here perhaps I may add one line expressive of my own indebtedness to and affectionate regard for my dear friend C. C. Massey, whose knowledge of all that relates to the higher problems before our Society is more profound than that of any one I know.

seen. Waves in the luminiferous ether require a material medium to absorb them before they can be perceived by our senses. The intermediary may be a photographic plate, a fluorescent screen, the retina, a black surface, or an electric resonator, according to the length of those waves. But some medium formed of ponderable matter is absolutely necessary to render the actinic, luminous, thermal, or electrical effects of these waves perceptible to our senses. And the more or less perfect rendering of the invisible waves depends on the more or less perfect synchronism between the unseen motions of the ether and the response of the material medium that absorbs and manifests them.

Thus we find certain definite physical media are necessary to enable operations to become perceptible which otherwise remain imperceptible. Through these media energy traversing the unseen is thereby arrested, and, passing through ponderable matter, is able to affect our senses and arouse consciousness.

Now, the nexus between the seen and the unseen may be physical or psychical, but it is always a specialized substance, or living organism. In some cases the receiver is a body in a state of unstable equilibrium, a sensitive material—like one of Sir Oliver Lodge's receivers for wireless telegraphy—and in that case its behavior and idiosyncrasies need to be studied beforehand. It is doubtless a peculiar psychical state, of the nature of which we know nothing, that enables certain persons whom we call mediums to act as receivers, or resonators, through which an unseen intelligence can manifest itself to us. And this receptive state is probably a sensitive condition easily affected by its mental environment.

We should not go to a photographer who took no trouble to protect his plates from careless exposure before putting them in the camera. And I do not know why we should expect anything but a confused result from a so-called medium (or automatist, as Myers suggested they should be called) if the mental state of those present reacts unfavorably upon the sensitive. Infinite patience and laborious care in observation we must have (as in all difficult investigation), but what good results from any scientific research could we expect, if we started with

the presumption that there was nothing to investigate but imposture?

In connection with this subject of mediumship, it seems to me very probable that a medium, an intermediary of some sort, is not only required on our side in the seen, but is also required on the other side in the unseen. In all communication of thought from one person to another a double translation is necessary. Thought, in some inscrutable way, acts upon the medium of our brain, and becomes expressed in written or spoken words. These words, after passing through space, have again to be translated back to thought through the medium of another brain. That is to say, there is a descent from thought to gross matter on one side, a transmission through space, and an ascent from gross matter to thought on the other side Now the so-called medium, or automatist, acts as *our* brain, translating for us the impressions made upon it and which it receives across space from the unseen. But there must be a corresponding descent of thought on the other side to such a telepathic form that it can act upon the material particles of the brain of our medium. It may be even more difficult to find a spirit medium there than here. No doubt wisely so, for the invasion of our consciousness here might otherwise be so frequent and troublesome as to paralyze the conduct of our life. It is possible, therefore, that much of the difficulty and confusion of the manifestations which are recorded in our *Proceedings*, and in the very valuable contribution which Mr. Piddington has just given us of sittings with Mrs. Thompson, are due to inevitable difficulties in translation on both sides.[1]

[1] Miss Jane Barlow, who has made a close study of these communications, writes to me on this point: "The almost unimaginable difficulty in communicating may account for many of the failures, mistakes, and absurdities we notice. I think we are apt to lay too much stress on the want of memory. Apart from purely evidential considerations, there seems a tendency to regard it as a larger and more essential element of Personality than it really is. In my own case for instance, any trivial cause—a headache, a cold, or a little flurry—scatters my memory for proper names. I can easily imagine myself forgetting my own name without suffering from any serious confusion of intellect in other respects, or the least decay of personality."

Furthermore, if my view be correct, that the self-conscious part of our personality plays but a subordinate part in any telepathic transmission, whether from incarnate or discarnate minds, we shall realize how enormously complex the problem becomes. So that the real persons whom we knew on earth may find the difficulty of self-manifestation too great to overcome, and only a fitful fragment of their thoughts can thus reach us.

There is, however, another view of the matter which to me seems very probable. The transition from this life to the next may in some respects resemble our ordinary awakening from sleep. The discarnate soul not improbably regards the circumstances of his past life, "in this dream world of ours," as we now regard a dream upon awakening. If, even immediately upon awakening, we try to recall all the incidents of a more or less vivid dream, we find how difficult it is to do so, how fragmentary the whole appears; and yet in some way we are conscious the dream was a far more coherent and real thing than we can express in our waking moments. Is it not a frequent and provoking experience that while some trivial features recur to us, the dream as a whole is elusive, and as time passes on even the most vivid dream is gone beyond recall? May it not be that something analogous to this awaits us when we find ourselves amid the transcendent realities of the unseen universe? The deep impress of the present life will doubtless be left on our personality, but its details may be difficult to bring into consciousness, and we may find them fading from us as we wake to the dawn of the eternal day.

Whatever view we take, the records of these manifestations in our *Proceedings* give us the impression of a truncated personality, "the dwindling remnant of a life," rather than of a fuller, larger life. Hence, while in my opinion psychical research *does* show us that intelligence can exist in the unseen, and personality can survive the shock of death, we must not confuse mere, and perhaps temporary, survival after death with that higher and more expanded life which we desire and mean by immortality, and the attainment of which, whatever may be our creed, is only to be won through the "process of the Cross."

For it is by self-surrender, the surrender, that is, of all that fetters "What we feel within ourselves is highest," that we enter the pathway of self-realization. Or as Tennyson expresses it:

> "Thro' loss of Self
> The gain of such large life as match'd with ours
> Were Sun to spark—unshadowable in words,
> Themselves but shadows of a shadow-world."[1]

[1] So also Goethe:

> "Und so lang du das nicht hast,
> Dieses: 'stirb und werde'!
> Bist du nur ein trüber Gast
> Auf der dunklen Erde."

XXXVII

HYPNOTISM

"ITS HISTORY, NATURE, AND USE"

BY

HAROLD M. HAYS,

PHYSICIAN OF MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL

OF all these vague reachings toward the occult, these mysterious influences of mind on mind, no other, as Professor Barrett has pointed out for us, is so definitely recognized and established as hypnotism. This force, weird and inexplicable as its action still remains, has been positively accepted within the domain of fact. It is medically employed in the treatment of disease. It begins to be matter of experiment in the inculcation of morality. This set of phenomena have therefore seemed to deserve special examination in our series, and the subject is presented from the pen of a man of the day and one of ourselves, a New York physician, in actual practice and of scholarly repute, Dr. Harold M. Hays. His discussion is reprinted by permission from the Popular Science Monthly, where its appearance drew much approving comment.

IT is perhaps unnecessary to state that the word hypnotism brings to the mind of the average person timid recollections of many criminal acts. That is because few people hear of hypnotism in its proper sphere. It is clothed with the garb of shame; it is surrounded with all the horror belonging to the age of witchcraft. Newspapers delight in depicting its bad sides, in painting to the world the crimes that have been committed under its influence, the fearful results of its all-powerful spell. To most it means a giving up of one's will to another who is

superior, the crushing of one's entity by the power of another, the total abstinence of individual self-control, the entire weakening of one's higher intelligence. Vivid imagination supplies the result—suffering, hardship, labor, and total subservience.

The question arises, "Why should hypnotism have been thus derided?" Simply and plainly because the ignorance of people in general has given it no opportunity to show its good sides. Unfortunately, people are always looking for the "eternal gullible" and are not satisfied until they get a taste of it. And, as hypnotism was first practised solely and is now practised mostly by men who have made the world their dupes, the world has had to suffer in the advancement of hypnotism on a scientific basis. But it has been so with other sciences. Astrology and alchemy are now things of the past; but astronomy and chemistry are their results—two great and everlasting sciences. There is, therefore, still great hope for hypnotism; for, although known under different names for so many hundreds of years, it is still in its infancy and the scientific aspect of the subject is yet in embryo.

Before, however, proceeding to cases in point, we may review briefly the history of hypnotism up to the present day. Call it what we may, since the beginning of the world, before Noah ever went on the Ark or the whale swallowed Jonah (much to the discomfort of both), hypnotism has been practised. The influence of one man over another by a certain innate quality or by personal magnetism has always been. Even Eve exerted an influence over Adam which has precipitated the world into misery and kept it there ever since. As time went on, people recognized this influence, gave it a name and called it the influence of the gods, the result being that those who were ordained with this wonderful power were called God's ministers. Soothsayers, divine healers, the oracle ministers, all made the Oriental people construe this power by religious means. Among the Chaldeans, Babylonians, Persians, Hindoos, and other ancient peoples, there were priests who, because of their power of exerting a superhuman influence over others, were considered divine. To this day the yogis and fakirs of India use this power and throw themselves into a state of hynotic

ecstasy and revery. In the eleventh century it was used in the Greek Church, as it is now by the omphalopsychics. In the Middle Ages it was practised by Paracelsus, who maintained that the human body possessed a double magnetism, the first magnetism coming from the planets, the second from flesh and blood. All through the Middle Ages hypnotism was practised under different names, such as witchcraft, divinations, etc. It was supposed to be a supernatural power derived from Satan himself, and, therefore, the user of this power was expelled from society and sometimes put to death. Magic spells where people went into trances or out of their head were of common occurrence. Religious ecstasy, demon-possession, cures by shrines and relics, the cure by the king's touch, etc., were all phenomena of this same sort.

During the seventeenth century a number of faith healers sprang up all over the Continent and British Isles. Many of these men were noted for their skill, but the one who attained the greatest reputation was one by the name of Greatrakes, who was born in Ireland about 1628. This "healer" was sent for by a Lord Conway, who expressed his message in the following language: "to cure that excellent lady of his, the pains of whose head, as great and unparalleled as they are, have not made her more known or admired abroad than have her other endowments." At Lady Conway's was a miscellaneous gathering, chiefly engaged in mystical pursuits, "an unofficial but active society for psychical research, as that study existed in the seventeenth century." Says Mr. Lang: Greatrakes' special genius in these mystical pursuits was of divine agency; for he tells us that at one time "he heard a voyce within him (audible to none else), encouraging to the tryals: and afterwards to correct his unbelief the voice aforesaid added this sign, that *his right hand should be dead, and that the stroaking of his left arm should recover it again*, the events whereof were fully verified by him three nights together by a successive infirmity and cure of his arm." We are told that he failed to cure the lady's malady, but that he worked some wonderful miracles of healing among the sick of the neighborhood.

Henry Stubbe, a physician of Stratford-on-Avon, thus

comments on Greatrakes' miracles. He says "that God had bestowed upon Mr. Greatrakes a peculiar temperament, etc., composed his body of some particular ferments, the effluvia whereof, being sometimes introduced by a light, sometimes by a violent friction, should restore the temperament of the debilitated parts, reinvigorate the blood and dissipate all heterogeneous ferments out of the bodies of the diseased, by the eyes, nose, mouth, hands, and feet." Indeed, he recognized the difference between functional and organic complaints; and he only meddled with such diseases as "have their essence either in the masse of blood and spirit (or nervous liquors) or the particular temperament of the part of the body" and attempted to cure no disease "wherein there is a decay of nature." "This is a confessed truth by him, he refusing still to touch the eyes of such as their sight has quite perished." None the less his cures were regarded as miraculous, and Dr. Stubbe tells us that "as there is but one Mr. Greatrakes, so there is but one Sonne"; Greatrakes' method consisted principally in *stroaking* and *passings* and in driving the pains from one point to another until they went out at the fingers or toes.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century many fakirs, alleged philosophers, quacks, and cosmongerers came to the front. Swedenborg, with his inspirations; Cagliostro, with his idea of personal power; Schrepfer, with the beginning of spiritualism; and then Gassner, the priest healer, who gave to Mesmer later on some of the ideas for the foundation of his theories.

Johann Joseph Gassner, a Swabian priest, appeared upon the scene in 1773. He was a forerunner of our modern spiritualist in a way, but had the added distinction of attributing all diseases to the devil. So his object was to pray for the expulsion of this satanic being. The patient had to have implicit faith and was made to give a detailed account of his malady. Gassner's next procedure was to chant various symptoms such as pain, weakness, stiffness, etc., and at his peremptory command to "stop," these symptoms would disappear and the patient be well again. At the words "You will cease being disabled," the patient's symptoms vanished. "Your right hand and arm will become somewhat weak," he says;

and no sooner are the words out his mouth than the right hand is cold and numb and the pulse is accelerated. "Your left hand will become as your right one was and this one will be normal," is his next invocation, whereupon the left hand is cold and numb and the right returns to normal. Gassner keeps up these incantations until the patient is entirely cured, each prayer being accompanied by the invocation that "this is accomplished in the name of the Lord, Our Father." Gassner's cures in theory and practice were identical with those of Greatrakes, except that the mystery was now clothed in a religious garb. In both, the predominant idea was the suggestion to the patient that he would get well.

The reason why hypnotism was not studied scientifically until the middle of the eighteenth century was that there was too much of an air of mystery surrounding the workings of the phenomena. Whenever hypnotic power was discovered in a person, he at once considered himself as one who possessed attributes which placed him above the plane of society. Suggestion was of course practised as it always has been, but the true idea of what the power consisted of was unknown. At last, toward the close of the century, Frederick Anton Mesmer rose before the world as a disciple of a new force which was destined to turn the scale on to the side of science and forever after to present hypnotism in a new light.

Frederick Anton Mesmer was born at Weil, near the point at which the Rhine leaves the Lake of Constance, on May 23, 1733. He studied medicine at Vienna under eminent masters, although at first his parents had destined him for the church. Interested in astrology, he imagined that the stars exerted an influence on beings living on the earth. He identified the supposed force first with electricity and then with magnetism; and it was but a short step to suppose that stroking diseased bodies with magnets might effect a cure. In 1776, meeting Gassner in Switzerland, he observed that the priest effected cures without the use of magnets, but by manipulation alone. This led Mesmer to discard the magnets, and to suppose that some kind of occult force resided in himself by which he could influence others. Mesmer's first practical work with magnets

was in 1779, when he magnetized a young lady complaining of various functional disorders. This emotional young lady "felt internally a painful streaming of a very fine substance, now here, now there, but finally settling in the lower part of her body and freeing her from all further attacks for six hours." She was extremely sensitive to any of Mesmer's suggestions, but would obey no one but him. Thus we see the primeval workings of animal magnetism, afterward called hypnotism.

Mesmer removed to Paris in 1778, and in a short time the French capital was thrown into a state of great excitement by the marvellous effects of what he called mesmerism. Mesmer soon made many converts; controversies arose; he excited the indignation of the medical faculty of Paris, who stigmatized him as a charlatan; still the people crowded to him.

While at Paris his practice became so enormous that it was impossible for him to handle all his patients. So he invented a scheme by which a number of his patients could be magnetized at once. He had troughs filled with bottles of water and iron filings, around which the patients stood holding iron rods which issued from the troughs. All the subjects were tied to each other by cords so that they could not break away and thus spoil the contact. Perfect silence was necessary and soft music was heard. The patients were affected variously, according to the suggestion Mesmer gave them. Some became hysterical, others crazed, some became affectionate and embraced each other, while others laughed and became repulsive. This lasted for hours and was followed by states of dreaminess and languor. A picture given by Binet and Feret, two eminent French scientists, will present an idea of these meetings.

"Mesmer, wearing a coat of lilac silk, walked up and down amid this agitated throng accompanied by Deslon and his associates whom he chose for their youth and comeliness. Mesmer carried a long iron wand, with which he touched the bodies of the patients and especially the diseased parts. Often laying aside the wand, he magnetized the patients with his eyes, fixing his gaze on theirs, or applying his hand to the hypochondriac region and to the abdomen. This application was often applied for hours, and at other times the master made use of

passes. He began by placing himself 'en rapport' with his subject. Seated opposite to him, foot against foot, knee against knee, Mesmer laid his fingers on the hypochondriac region and moved them to and fro, lightly touching the ribs. Magnetism with strong electric currents was substituted for these manipulations when more energetic results were to be produced. The master, raising his fingers in a pyramidal form, passed his hands all over the patient's body, beginning with the head and going downward over the shoulders to the feet. He then returned to the head, both back and front, to the belly and the back, and renewed the process again and again until the magnetized person was saturated with the healing fluid and transported with pain or pleasure, both sensations being equally salutary. Young women were so much gratified by the crisis that they wished to be thrown into it anew. They followed Mesmer through the halls and confessed that it was impossible not to be warmly attached to the person of the magnetizer."

Mesmer was not an impostor by any means. He had deceived himself and had thus deceived others. But the Academy of Sciences in Paris believed that he was a mystic and a fanatic, and made it so hot for him that he was finally forced to leave France, where, however, he returned later. He died in 1815, and for a time animal magnetism fell into disrepute and Mesmer was denounced as an impostor.

Before Mesmer's death, he moved from Paris to a secluded spot among the hills. We see him at the last—bitterly complaining of the treatment he had received, thoroughly convinced as to the truth of his pet theories, performing various cures for the peasants about him, and living the simple life of a hermit.

Throughout Mesmer's career, the streets were not paved with gold. Many people died under his treatment, giving the belief that the treatment itself was the cause of death. He was treated with ridicule wherever he went. Papers, plays, etc., brought him even more prominently before the public in a more ridiculous light than his own hypothetical and mystical performances. A comedy, "Docteur Modernes" brought his procedures on the stage. It severely criticised his "fanatical" enthusiasm for a quondam science and portrayed the supposed

abuses of his treatment. In England notices like the following appeared in the leading journals:

"The Wonderful Magnetical Elixir. Take of the chemical oil of Fear, Dread, and Terror, each 4 oz.; of the Rectified Spirits of Imagination, 2 lbs. Put all these ingredients into a bottle of fancy, digest for several days, and take forty drops at about nine in the morning, or a few minutes before you receive a portion of the magnetic Effluvia. They will make the effluvia have a surprising effect, etc., etc."

Once, in 1785, a mock funeral oration upon Mesmer took place, making his exhibitions and theories seem more ridiculous than ever. Thus he was tossed about between ridicule and praise until, as we have seen, his life was hardly one of harmony or joy.

Braid.

Although a number of men followed Mesmer, appropriating his method, enlarging upon it and changing it somewhat—such men as de Puysegur—it will be impossible in such a brief essay to tell of all of them. However, there is one man who rose up in the chaos of the times and again added new facts and theories to the science. This man was Braid, a surgeon of Manchester, England. Braid was born in the year 1795 on his father's estate in Fifeshire. He received his education at the University of Edinburgh, later being apprenticed to Dr. Chas. Anderson, of Leith. After graduating, he was appointed surgeon to the Hopetown mining works in Lanarkshire, later moving to Dumfries, where he engaged in practice with a Dr. Maxwell. An accident happening at that time brought to his town a Mr. Petty, who finally persuaded him to move to Manchester. It was here that he carefully worked on his new discovery and practised his cures. He died on March 25, 1860.

There is very little in Braid's life of especial interest, except his investigations in animal magnetism. His life seems to have been particularly free from the early struggles of a young practitioner. His interest in animal magnetism dates from the time he witnessed a séance by a M. Lafontaine, a travelling

mesmerist. He was extremely skeptical, but this one urged him to try experimenting himself.

In 1866 this M. Ch. Lafontaine, a travelling mesmerist, published his "Memoirs of a Magnetizer." If it had not been for this, the electro-biologists of America, under one named Grimes, might have claimed prior right to the discovery of hypnotism. M. Lafontaine thus describes the state of affairs at that time:

"Having accomplished the cure of numerous deaf and blind persons," says he with modest assurance, "as also numerous epileptic and paralytic sufferers at the hospital (this was in Birmingham), I repaired to Liverpool, but only to meet with disappointment; few persons attended the séance; and on the following day I proceeded to Manchester, in which city my success was conspicuous. The newspapers reported my experiments at great length, and to give some idea of the sensation I created I may say that my séances returned me a gross total of 30,000 frances. I put to sleep a number of persons who were well-known residents of Manchester. I caused deaf mutes to hear, operated a number of brilliant cures. After my departure, Dr. Braid, a surgeon in Manchester, delivered a lecture in which he proposed to prove that magnetism was non-existent. *From this lecture Braidism, afterwards called hypnotism, originated*, ardent discussions arising, even from the beginning, over this pretended discovery. I received letters from Manchester entreating me to return, and I did so on a date when Dr. Braid had announced a demonstration. His experiments were given, but unfortunately on this occasion none of them succeeded; neither sleep nor catalepsy was obtained, and every moment I was appealed to. In the facts that were advanced on this occasion by Dr. Braid, there was in my opinion absolutely nothing that was remarkable, and had not that gentleman been honorably known in the town I should have supposed that he was mystifying his audience. The next day, and for six days consecutively, I experimented after his own fashion on fifty or sixty subjects and the results were practically *nil.* I then gave a magnetic séance and the results on Eugene and Mary were marked and positive."

The value of the quotation rests solely on the opportune remark that Braid was the first to apply the name hypnotism to animal magnetism. One should not forget that Eugene and Mary were two subjects whom Lafontaine carried with him from town to town and on whom he could rely for phenomena.

Though Braid survived his discovery by not more than eighteen years, he lived to know that it was well on the road to acceptance by the competent opinion of the time. In the latter part of his life he said: "I feel no anxiety for the fate of hypnotism, provided it only has 'a fair field and no favor.' I am content to bide my time, in the firm conviction that truth, for which alone I most earnestly strive, with the discovery of the safest, and surest, and speediest modes of relieving human suffering, will ultimately triumph over error" ("Magic, Witch," p. 53).

The enemies of Braid were as vociferous in their denunciation of him as his friends were earnest in their praise. And what may seem the greatest surprise and yet what seems to be a natural consequence of opposition, the Mesmerists themselves were the ones who were the loudest in opposing him. However, his method has stood the test of years and still prevails among those who practise the art nowadays.

As was said before, the first exhibition that Braid ever attended was one given by this same Lafontaine. One fact, *the inability of the patient to open his eyelids*, arrested his attention. He considered this a real phenomenon and was anxious to discover the physiological cause of it.

"In two days afterward," he says, "I developed my views to my friend Captain Brown, as I had previously done to four other friends; and in his presence and that of my family and another friend, the same evening, I instituted a series of experiments to prove the correctness of my theory—namely that the continued fixed stare, by paralyzing nervous centres in the eyes and their appendages and destroying the equilibrium of the nervous system, thus proved the phenomenon referred to. The experiments were varied so as to convince all present that they fully bore out the correctness of my theoretical views. My first object was to prove that the inability of the patient to

open his eyes was caused by paralyzing the upper muscles of the eyes, through their continued action during the protracted fixed stare, and thus rendering it *physically* impossible for him to open them. With the view of proving this, I requested Mr. Walker, a young gentlemen present, to sit down, and maintain a fixed stare at the top of a wine bottle, placed so much above him as to produce a considerable strain on the eyes and eyelids, to enable him to maintain a steady view of the object. In three minutes his eyelids closed, a gush of tears ran down his cheeks, his head drooped, his face was slightly convulsed, he gave a groan and instantly fell into a profound sleep, the respiration becoming slow, deep, and sibilant, the right hand and arm being agitated by slight convulsive movements. At the end of four minutes, I considered it necessary, for his safety, to put an end to the experiment."

Braid became so convinced that his interpretation of the phenomena was the correct one that he used it universally, succeeding in a remarkable number of cases. His method was as follows:

He would take any bright object, most often his lancet case, and, holding it about fifteen inches from the eyes, and in such a position as to strain them and still allow the patient to gaze steadily at it, he would carry it slowly toward them until the eyelids closed involuntarily. After a preliminary contraction of the pupils, they would dilate, and finally a tremulous motion of the iris would take place. If this did not succeed after a few minutes, he would try again, letting the patient understand that his eyes and mind had to be riveted on the one idea of the object before him. The primary fact was the fixation of the mind on a certain object. Nay, even the hypnotist himself, if he use the method of attraction, may be hypnotized, as Braid shows in the following example. Mr. Walker, Braid's friend, offered to hypnotize a certain person. When Braid went into the room where the experiment was going on he saw the gentleman sitting staring at Mr. Walker's finger. Mr. Walker was standing a little to the right of his patient with his eyes fixed steadily on those of the latter. Braid passed on, and when he returned he found Mr. Walker standing in the same

position fast asleep, his arm and finger perfectly rigid and the patient wide awake, staring at the finger all the while.

After Braid, many men pursued the scientific investigation of the phenomena. The interest in the new science since 1875 has spread quickly over Europe. In Belgium, the eminent psychologist Delboeuf of Liège made a path for it. In Holland such men as Van Reuterghem, Van Eiden, and De Jong used hypnotism for curative purposes; in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden there were Johannessen, Sell, Frankel, Calsen, and Wetterstrand, of Stockholm, and finally Swedenborg. In Russia were Strembo and Tokarski; in Greece, Italy, and Spain hypnotism has greatly come into play in medical treatment. In England Carpenter, Laydock, Sir James Simpson, Lloyd-Tuckey, Mayo, and others have used it for curing the sick. In America the science also has its advocates. It is one of the subjects constantly appearing before the Society for Psychical Research. In South America it numbers among its adherents David Benavente and Octavio Maria, of Chili. The interest in hypnotism in France centred around two schools, the school of Salpêtrière and the school of Nancy. The former was led by Charcot, whose luminous researches in this subject are epoch-making.

The Paris school held that hypnotism is the result of an abnormal or diseased condition of the nervous system; that suggestion is not at all necessary to produce the phenomena; that hysterical subjects are the most easily influenced; and that the whole subject is explainable on the basis of cerebral anatomy and physiology. But lately the followers of Charcot, who had been numerous in the beginning because he was so highly reliable a man, have begun to dwindle away and have turned to the school of Nancy. The reason for this is obvious to any one who has studied hypnotic phenomena. The first objection to the school of Salpêtrière is that most of the experiments have been made on hysterical women. In the second place, this school ignores suggestion, which has been found to be one of the most important factors in hypnotism. They appreciate of course that it can be used, but assert that it is not necessary.

The school of Nancy, led by Bernheim, met with equal

success and is now upheld by more people than the other school. The theory of the school of Nancy may be summed up in a few words: first, the different psychological conditions in the hypnotic state are determined by mental action; secondly, people of good sound physical health and of perfect mental balance can produce the best results; and thirdly, all the mental and physical actions are the results of suggestion. In fact suggestion is the all-important factor in producing the various phenomena.

Liébault and Bernheim, his pupil, by bringing forth the idea of suggestion, have made themselves in a way the equal of Braid, for in continuation of the latter's method the method of the former is always used nowadays. The influence of Bernheim over his patients is remarkable. His great success may be accounted for by the confidence his patients have in him. Of course the low intellectual state of the peasant class of France may have something to do with it, for one can hardly think that in any ordinary community this supreme belief and trust in a human being could exist. To Nancy people come from all over the provinces to visit this "Man of God," who performs experiments and cures which seem divine. Bernheim goes from one patient to another, shouting "Sleep!" Many of them having been hypnotized by him often, fall into the state immediately. When the experiments are over he goes the rounds of his patients, snapping his fingers, in which way he awakens them.

To sum up, then, we may say the history of hypnotism may be divided into five epochs. The first, before the time of Mesmer; the second, the age of Mesmerism, when personal magnetism was supposed to be the attractive power; the third, the age of Braid, when the science was put on a physiological basis; the fourth, the age of Bernheim and Charcot, when the idea of suggestion was brought to the front and hypnotism was used indiscriminately; and lastly, the fifth, the age we are in now, where the tendency is to restrict hypnotism and to classify it for specific uses.

The Nature of Hypnotism.

Each individual has a separate state of consciousness which changes as do the thoughts therein. It is in the waking state that we have separate individualities. Now let us see the gradations of this consciousness. At this present moment we shall say we are listening intently to a sermon. That is the thing uppermost in our minds, and as long as our minds are upon it we are exercising acute consciousness. But, even if our attention to this sermon is the central thing, in the fringe of our mental picture a number of other thoughts are jumping around, any one of which may be powerful enough to force its way into the middle of the picture and to usurp its place. For example, all the while we are listening to this sermon we are more or less conscious that the seats we are in are hard, that somebody is talking next to us, etc. Our seats may become so uncomfortable that it may occupy our whole attention, or something outside may seem of more interest. If our attention jumps from one thing to another, this is called diffused consciousness. The next step to diffused consciousness is the dreamy state where the mind is half way between waking and sleep. Anything may come into the mind while in this state and be the predominant idea, to be chased out again by a next idea. It is for this reason that dreams usually present such a chaos and jumble. Our thoughts tumble over one another to get from the fringe of consciousness to the foreground. Any external sensation will be greatly exaggerated and may turn the trend of our thought. A warm bed might feel like the fire of hell, a heavy dinner with indigestion like the battles of heroes using our poor bodies as the fighting ground. As dreams gradually fade away we approach our first hypnosis or sleep, which, in the beginning, is slight, but gradually deepens, finally consciousness being entirely lost.

Thus we have traced the process of natural sleep to which hypnotic sleep is closely akin. The person at first has a diffused attention, he then confines his attention to sleep, he next passes into a dreaming state, then into a light sleep and lastly into a deep sleep.

The differences between it and natural sleep are as follows: first, the state ordinarily is produced by another; secondly, the person must have faith; and thirdly, the phenomena in the sleep must be produced by suggestion. The two latter were fully recognized years ago and have formed the basis of all psychical cures ever since. How the sleep can be produced by another was seen in the experiments of Braid, where one appreciates fully that the person really hypnotizes himself by gazing at an object. The full understanding between hypnotized and hypnotist has never been really understood, and so here we are stopped short.

The theory of Dr. Hudson may put us on the right track. Because it is so convenient a theory and tends to make plausible a number of things which otherwise could not be understood, I am going to take the liberty of detailing it here. Dr. Hudson claims that every normal person is possessed of two minds, a subjective one and an objective one. The objective mind is the one we use every day, a mind fully capable of forgetting and the only one of which we are ordinarily cognizant. The subjective mind is the *perfect* mind wherein are stored up all the numerous thoughts that have ever come into it, there lying dormant, only to be reawakened when a new set of associations brings them forth.

It is this mind which we may say is used in hypnotism, in somnambulism, the one which shows itself in altered personality and in various other abnormalities. Some authors consider this the subliminal or subconscious mind.[1]

That there is another mind far more perfect and which brings to our recollection many things forgotten, seems to be an undisputed fact. When a drug like Cannabis indica is used, or when a person is drowning, there come before his mind's eye, in a single moment, the doings of years. And so in some recorded cases of trance states the same thing is proved. A

[1] One cannot help realizing that this theory will never be fully accepted. Most psychologists are still quarrelling over concepts, and no two will agree as to what is meant by a subjective or an objective mind.

highly interesting case is given by Mr. Coleridge in his "Biographica Literaria."

Mr. Coleridge says:

"It occurred in a Roman Catholic town in Germany, a year or two before my arrival at Göttingen, and had not then ceased to be a frequent subject of conversation. A young woman of four or five and twenty, who could neither read nor write, was seized with a nervous fever, during which, according to the asseverations of all the priests and monks of the neighborhood, she became possessed, and as it appeared, by a very learned devil. She continued incessantly talking Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, in very pompous tones, and with a most distinct enunciation. This possession was rendered more probable by the known fact that she was, or had been, a heretic. The case had attracted the particular attention of a young physician, and by his statement many eminent physiologists and psychologists visited the town and cross examined the case on the spot. Sheets full of her ravings were taken down from her own mouth and were found to consist of sentences, coherent and intelligible each for itself, but with little or no connection with each other. Of the Hebrew, a small portion only could be traced to the Bible; the remainder seemed to be in Rabbinical dialect. All trick or conspiracy was out of the question. Not only had the young woman been a harmless simple creature, but she was evidently under a nervous fever. In the town in which she had been resident for many years as a servant in different families, no solution presented itself. The young physician, however, determined to trace her past life, step by step; for the patient herself was incapable of returning a rational answer. He at length succeeded in discovering the place where her parents had lived, travelled thither, found them both dead, but an uncle surviving, and from him learned that the patient had been charitably taken by an old Protestant pastor at nine years old, and had remained with him some years, even till the old man's death. Of this pastor the uncle knew nothing, but that he was a very good man. With great difficulty and after much search, our young medical philosopher discovered a niece of the pastor's, who had lived with him as housekeeper and had inherited his

effects. She remembered the girl; related that her venerable uncle had been too indulgent, and could not hear the girl scolded; that she was willing to have kept her, but that, after her parents' death, the girl herself refused to stay. Anxious inquiries were then, of course, made concerning the pastor's habits; and the solution of the phenomenon was soon obtained. For it appeared that it had been the old man's custom for years to walk up and down a passage of his house into which the kitchen door opened, and to read to himself, with a loud voice, out of his favorite books. A considerable number of these were still in the niece's possession. She added that he was a very learned man and a great Hebraist. Among the books was found a collection of Rabbinical writings, together with several of the Greek and Latin fathers; and the physician succeeded in identifying so many passages with those taken down at the young woman's bedside that no doubt could remain in any rational mind concerning the true origin of the impression made on her nervous system."

The same power of the subjective mind is many times seen in hypnotic phenomena. The case cited is but one of a number, all of which are just as wonderful. Being a mind so perfectly endowed, it is hardly too audacious to say that this mind exercises its influence over all bodily functions, so that any function may be inhibited or accelerated by its influence. For example, the following is related of Henry Clay.

"On one occasion he was unexpectedly called upon to answer an opponent who addressed the Senate on a question in which Clay was deeply interested. The latter felt too ill to reply at length. It seemed imperative, however, that he should say something; and he exacted a promise from a friend who sat behind him that he would stop him at the end of ten minutes. Accordingly, at the expiration of the prescribed time the friend gently pulled the skirts of Mr. Clay's coat. No attention was paid to the hint, and after a brief time it was repeated a little more imperatively. Still Clay paid no attention and it was again repeated. Then a pin was brought into requisition; but Clay was by that time thoroughly aroused, and was pouring forth a torrent of eloquence. The pin was inserted

deeper and deeper into the orator's leg without eliciting any response, until his friend gave up in despair. Finally Mr. Clay happened to glance at the clock and saw that he had been speaking two hours; whereupon he fell into his friend's arms, completely overcome by exhaustion, upbraiding his friend severely for not stopping him at the prescribed time.

The fact that Mr. Clay, on that occasion, made one of the ablest speeches of his life, two hours in length, at a time when he felt almost too ill to rise to his feet, and that his body was at the time in a condition of perfect anæsthesia, is a splendid illustration of the synchronous action of the two minds, and also of the perfect control exercised by the subjective mind over the functions and sensations of the body ("Law of Psychic Phenomena").

I now propose to attempt to explain some of the phenomena of hypnotism by reviewing thoroughly a specific example.

On November 23, 1901, I was asked by a young lady to try to cure her of biting her fingernails. She was then about eighteen years of age. I immediately replied that I should be glad to do so if I had her full permission. Besides her and myself, there were four or five other persons in the room, including her father and mother. Getting her perfectly composed, I placed my hand on the top of her head, and told her to turn her eyes in the direction of the hand. This tired her eyes very readily. They became heavier, the eyelids twitched and inside of five minutes they fell and she was sound asleep. I first placed her in a cataleptic condition. I told her her arm was a piece of stone and therefore could not be bent. Two or three of those assembled tried to bend it, but failed. Then by more suggestions I placed her in an anæsthetic condition and rubbed the ball of her eye. She neither winked nor flinched. I then gave her a few post-hypnotic suggestions. For example, I told her that when she awakened she would go over and close the window, that she would then thank me for what I had done, and would feel no bad effects and also would remember nothing. Then I told her that the following Sunday I would come over, and, as soon as I told her to go to sleep, she would do so. When she awoke, she went over and closed the window, and then

thanked me for what I had done. She remembered nothing and felt much rested. Of course, suggestions were constantly given that she would not bite her nails.

The following Sunday, I went over there again. She had not bitten her fingernails since the last time I saw her. I told her to lie down and that in three minutes she would be sound asleep. I used no method whatsoever. In fact, I was in another room. When the three minutes were up, I went in to her and found her in a deep sleep. I impressed on her a number of times that she would never bite her fingernails again. I placed her in a chair, telling her to open her eyes. She was to see or hear nobody but me. A number of people stood before her, but she could not see them. I asked her a question which she readily answered. Then somebody else asked her the same question, but no answer could be got from her. She seemed perfectly deaf to their words. I asked her if she heard anybody else and she answered "No." I next procured a needle which was perfectly clean, and telling her she would feel no pain I ran it into her forearm for over half an inch. Very little blood appeared, as I had suggested, and she felt nothing. In fact, after the experiments were over she did not know anything about the wound. Taking a glass of water, I told her it was whiskey. She took a little with some show of difficulty in swallowing, and when I told her to walk about the room she reeled around as though she were overcome by the liquor. I then procured some salt, telling her it was sugar and that it would cure her of her dizziness immediately. She took the salt, a half teaspoonful, said it tasted sweet, asked for more, and was entirely herself again. Finally I placed her between two people, putting her head on one's lap and her feet on the other's. She became cataleptic on my suggestion and when two hundred and fifty pounds were put on her body she sustained them very readily.

Before she awakened I gave her three suggestions: (1) That as soon as she awoke she would go into the front room and lie down on the sofa for a few minutes; (2) that she would go up to her parents and tell them that she was never going to bite her nails again; and (3) that two weeks from that night she

would sit down after supper and write me a letter, thanking me for what I had done. All these suggestions were carried into effect.

On Monday, December 9, two weeks and a day after the experiment had been made, I received the following letter:

"Dec. 8th, 1901.

"Dear Mr. Hays:

"I feel as though I owe you a note of thanks for the wonderful cure you have effected on me. I have not bitten my nails since three weeks ago to-night, and I am very proud of them. I am writing this to try to let you know how much I thank you. It seems remarkable that a little thing like hypnotism can do so much good, and I shall always feel grateful and indebted to you for this.

"Yours sincerely,

"E."

Not until after the letter had been sent did she find out that it had been I who prompted her to do it. This young lady has not bitten her fingernails since and is entirely cured.

We have already found the primary cause of the sleep when produced by the tiring of the eyes. The eyelids droop because the muscles become temporarily paralyzed. There is one advantage in placing the hand on top of the head. It is that it rolls the eyeballs upward, thus putting them in a natural position for sleep. The various other processes after the sleep has been produced are all dependent on the workings of the nervous system. Let us first try to explain the cataleptic state—how it is that the arm becomes so rigid that the bones can be broken before the arm will bend. The most plausible explanation to my mind is that impulses are sent from the brain which make one set of muscles counteract the influence of another set. For example, let us say that two men of equal strength are pulling with all their might on a thick stick. As long as the pull is the same on both sides, the stick won't move. How the mind can exert such an influence we do not know. This same idea of the counteraction of various muscles applies to the whole body as well as to one arm. Yet some one may ask how these muscles can have the power to stand more strain than they do in the waking state. It is only that as our normal selves we never use

our full muscle power. This is because not enough stimulation is ever given to the muscle to make it work to its full extent. But in cases of great excitement or danger even the weakest seem to have superhuman strength.

The loss of the sense of pain or anæsthesia can also be accounted for by the brain. When we say we have a pain in our finger, we don't really mean that. The cut is in the finger, but the pain is in the brain, and consciousness is necessary for us to have pain. Suppose a man is going to have an operation on his finger and is made unconscious. Now the finger is there, but the pain has disappeared, showing that pain is not located in various parts of the body, but in the domain of consciousness. So if, under hypnotic influence, you tell the patient that he will have no pain, he thinks the pain away, so to speak—knocks it out of his consciousness.

How we can run needles into people and produce no blood seems still more remarkable, but physiologically it *can* be explained. Let me say here that if any one should pierce a large artery with a needle serious consequences might result. Let us say that we penetrate the skin in a place where there are thousands of little capillaries. Each one of these vessels is connected with the nervous system by two sets of nerve fibres —those which can dilate the vessels, those which can constrict them. Now, suppose I give the suggestion that I am going to run a needle through a certain part of the arm. An impulse, sent from the brain, constricts the blood-vessels at this spot, inhibits the sense of pain, and the needle comes out again without a drop of blood following it.

The explanation of the dizziness from water supposed to be whiskey and the cure by salt supposed to be sugar is that both are the result of an unexplainable force whereby the patient takes every word of the hypnotizer as gospel, though it is contradictory to his own ideas. For example, in one case a patient told me that he knew the glass contained water and yet it tasted like whiskey, and he also knew that the cellar contained salt and yet it tasted like sugar.

The cure of the fingernail habit and all the post-hypnotic suggestions may be summed up briefly. All we should do is

to refer back to the perfect or subjective mind, where all these suggestions are stored up, and say that the objective mind draws nutriment from it, and in this nutriment these suggestions given under the hypnotic influence come into play.

Before closing this portion of the essay I should like to say that I believe hypnotism is not an occult power, but is a simple, natural, physiological process. And again, anybody can use the power just as any one can become a good piano player, or student, or business man by training. Yet it is only those with the natural tendency toward personal power who will make the greatest success.

It would indeed be pleasing to me to cite a number of wonderful cases where hypnotism has been used experimentally in order to show the great influence of the mind over the body—how a horse can be ridden over the outstretched body of a man in a cataleptic state, how illusions and hallucinations can be produced, how we may even obtain negative hallucinations, how we can turn an adult into a child, how we can conjure before the mind's eye vistas grand and superb, panoramas gorgeous and elegant, how the commonest man may become an orator, a saint, an assassin perhaps. But all these things would be far beyond the scope of this essay. However, one case seems to be of especial interest, as it shows how far hypnotism may be used in the cure of various inflammations.

"The experiment is on a nurse twenty-eight years old, who is not at all hysterical. She is a daughter of plain country people, and has been for a long time an attendant in the Zurich Lunatic Asylum, which Forel directs. He thinks her a capable, honest person, in no way inclined to deceit. The experiments were as follows: A gummed label was fixed upon her chest on either side; the paper was square. In no case was an irritating gum used. At midday Forel suggested that a blister had been put on the left side; and at six o'clock in the evening a moist spot had appeared in that place; the skin was swollen and red around it, and a little inflammation also appeared on the right side, but much less. Forel then did away with the suggestion. On the next day there was a scab on the left side. Forel had not watched the nurse between noon and six o'clock, but had

suggested that she could not scratch herself. The other nurses said that the subject could not raise her hand to her chest, but made vain attempts to scratch. Forel repeated the experiment later; he put on the paper at 11:45 A.M. and ordered the formation of blisters in two and one-half hours. Little pain was suggested, and the nurse therefore complained but little. At two o'clock Forel looked at the paper on the left side, for which the suggestion had been made, and saw around it a large swelling and reddening of the skin. The paper could with difficulty be removed. A moist surface of epidermis was then visible, exactly square like the paper. There was nothing particular under the paper on the right side. Forel then suggested the disappearance of the pain, inflammation, etc."

In time everything disappeared.

Many investigators have been able to bring about a change in blood supply and other visceral changes of a similar kind. Changes in temperature have been made as much as three degrees centigrade. Bernheim found that by suggestion he could induce local reddening of the skin. This is undoubtedly a vaso-motor change. These local red spots were often found in the Middle Ages on the hands of monks and nuns after they had been looking steadily at a cross for hours. At that time it was supposed to be a miracle and a message from the Divinity. In 1860, a woman was found with these spots or blisters caused by something unknown. It was learned that she got these while in the hypnotic state. The wounds healed in the normal way, and all that remained to make it necessary for it to be commented upon was that it gave the investigators the idea of trying to produce these spots by artificial means. Krafft-Ebing, a noted German physician, produced certain results analogous to those cited above. He would put something in the patient's hand and give him the suggestion that it was burning. A reddening would appear. He would take a scissors, a piece of metal, and a postage stamp (saying it was a mustard plaster), and would produce the same results.

Wonderful as it may seem—that hypnotic suggestion can produce such grave organic changes—the physician has only to

reflect for a moment on the powerful changes which the mind exerts over the course of a disease. He realizes only too well that the mental attitude of the patient toward his malady is of almost as much importance in the cure as the therapeutic measures he may advise. Processes of inflammation are purely physiological in the light of modern medicine, and yet there can be no inflammatory process which cannot be made worse by concentrated mental worry. A sore finger to the phlegmatic individual is a trifle: but the hysterical woman makes a "mountain out of a mole hill" of it and thereby actually makes the inflammation worse.

The Uses of Hypnotism.

The general tendency has been in the last decade to use hypnotism indiscriminately; but, like every therapeutic agent, it in time will become restricted and used only in certain complaints. It surely should be included by every physician in his "therapeutic arsenal." It has one thing in its favor which places it above all remedial agents, and that is that when it is used properly it can do no harm. We must recognize that in all the scientific literature on the subject there has not a single death been reported from its use. The unscientific application is its abuse.

We must also recognize that there are many cases that are practically incurable by medical treatment, cases which defy the greatest physicians, cases which are surprising because of their persistency. When the last extreme has been reached, when physicians consult and pronounce the case as practically incurable, hypnotism may be tried.

Before the advent of ether or chloroform, the possibility of using hypnotism for anæsthetic purposes was thought of and apparently its use in this direction met with success in a limited number of cases. In 1859, Dr. Guérineau announced that he had amputated a thigh under hypnotic anæsthesia. Some other reports are as follows: Jules Cloquent amputated a breast in 1845; Dr. Loysel of Cherbourg amputated a leg and

removed some glands in 1846; a double amputation of the legs by Drs. Fanton and Toswel in 1845; amputation of an arm by Dr. Joly in 1845; and in 1847 a tumor of the jaw was removed by Drs. Ribaud and Kiaro of Poitiers—all under hypnotic anæsthesia (Bernheim's "Suggestive Therapeutics").

But hypnotism was found to have more drawbacks than advantages in these cases of major surgery. In the first place, hypnotic anæsthesia is a difficult state to produce and even a more difficult state to maintain. Secondly, there is always the possibility of the patient awakening unexpectedly and dying from the shock of the operation.

Although it has thus fallen out of use as an anæsthetic in these serious cases, still it is used constantly, and more and more every day, in minor surgery. In dentistry it certainly has its place; in outpatient departments of our hospitals it is often of value, as it has no after-effects.

The various medical cases that have been treated by the hypnotic method are too numerous to recount. They include nearly every form of mental non-equilibrium and also cases of general organic trouble dependent more or less on the mental attitude of the patient. They include habits of various kinds, such as onychophagie or fingernail biting, excessive smoking, dypsomania, nervous twitchings, etc., nervous headaches, insomnia and neuralgias; chronic nervous constipation and diarrhœa and dyspepsia; local and general pain, insomnia and neurasthenia. Nor is this all. Hypnotism's greatest blessing consists in the cure of psychic paralytics and psychic hysterics. In this connection we may say that it should be used unconditionally. Dr. Starr in a lecture at the College of Physicians and Surgeons cited a case of paralysis in the left arm from the shoulder to the elbow. A physician knows that it is impossible to get a true paralysis of this kind. Dr. Starr hypnotized the patient in his clinic and in less than three minutes the arm was in as good working order as ever. During the course of the past year, I have worked on a few hysterical cases for physicians where nothing but hypnotism could cure them. A remarkable case of true organic nature came to my notice over a year ago. A lady had a severe swelling on her

finger which was so painful that I could hardly bandage it for her. I put her to sleep, suggested the pain away, told her the inflammation would subside the next day and awakened her. I could then do anything I wished to the finger without hurting her.

I have left aside the part that hypnotism plays in mental and moral culture—a phase of the subject so vast that it deserves more consideration than could be given here, but the possibilities of which must suggest themselves to all.

XXXVIII

THE WILL

"ITS CULTIVATION AND POWER"

BY

JULES FINOT

CLOSE allied to hypnotism and the vast field of new thoughts, new possibilities, which it is opening to man, come the problems and possibilities of the Will. Its power may be developed, trained, strengthened most amazingly, aroused to special lines of effort, set to special duties. Among the most interesting, perhaps the most valuable of its possibilities, is that here discussed by M. Jules Finot, the noted editor of the Paris Revue. *Can life be visibly and definitely prolonged, not at some distant day by our far-off descendants, but here and now, for each and every one of us, usefully, by the rightful direction of the will?*

What chances, what possibilities, does science thus hold out to us! What shifting of the whole machinery of civilization, if we may continue our individual work and our progress for a century or beyond!

I

To the nineteenth century may be ascribed the virtue of having sanctioned and explained the actual existence of certain disturbing facts which have been pointed out by chroniclers and historians for many centuries gone by. These facts, formerly regarded as lies, have suddenly changed their aspect. The power of suggestion, which has been verified, controlled, and admitted, has at the same time reduced the number of the impostors and miracles of past times. The most unlikely

phenomena have regained their veneer of reality. They are no longer contested, because they appear to us natural, possible, verifiable.

Thus we admit that St. Francis of Assisi, or St. Catherine of Siena, may have felt the pains of the Passion. Their prolonged attention fixed on the points where legend says the nails and the sword blade pierced the body of Christ, caused wounds. The blood flowed from them. These persistent wounds may, indeed, have induced in St. Francis, as well as much later in Louise Lataud, certain thickenings of skin covered with blood, which recalled the nail heads of the cross.

Why should we deny this palpable effect of suggestion while so many others, much more strange, discover themselves to our own eyes? Charles Richet and Barthélemy quote the case of a mother, a very nervous woman, who was present one day at an alarming spectacle: a heavy curtain-rod threatened to become detached and fall on her child kneeling close at hand. On the neck of the terrified mother a ring of erythema formed at the very place where the child might have been struck.

The influence of our sensations and ideas on our bodies is as multifarious as the sensations and ideas themselves. Carpenter tells of a man who, in spite of great muscular weakness, lifted a very heavy weight one day because he thought it insignificant. Corvisart attended the Empress Josephine and obtained satisfactory results by the administration of bread pills. At all times faith in miracles has produced those very miracles. Those at Lourdes are only a repetition of the votive tablets recovered from the Tiber which testify to the extraordinary feats accomplished by the Asclepiads. "In these last days," we read, "a certain Gaius, who was blind, learned from the oracle that he must repair to the altar, offer up prayers there, and then cross the temple from right to left, rest his five fingers on the altar, raise his hand, and place it over his eyes. He immediately recovered his sight in presence and amid the acclamations of the people."

If we take up the narratives published by Mr. Henri Lasserre in his "Lourdes," or by the Abbé Georges Bertin in his

"Critical History of the Events at Lourdes," we find similar phenomena. A lady who had become epileptic as the result of a great fright, submitted herself for examination to a number of doctors. All the remedies of science proved powerless. But she was taken to the grotto, and that visit, together with a novena, restored her to health.

Parallel to this is a story related by the ancients. A Roman soldier, Valerius Aper, recovers his sight because he follows the advice of the gods. In conformity with their command, he made a pomade of the blood of a white cock mixed with some honey, and with that he rubbed his eyes.

We need only read once again what Charcot, Hack Tuke, and many others recount of recoveries by suggestion to doubt neither the miracles of Lourdes nor many other miracles disputed by the centuries, ancient and modern. Even Pomponace made the malicious observation that while on one hand certain cures were only the effect of imagination and of faith in certain relics, it sufficed on the other "to put in the place of a saint's bones the bones of quite another skeleton without any prejudice to the sick. The cure resulted as long as the sufferer was ignorant of the change that had been effected." Following in the path of merciful tolerance inaugurated by Charcot, certain of his adepts practise a residence at the grotto of Lourdes on their believing patients. They are put to sleep and the idea is suggested to them that they are in the sacred grotto. In the same way the Holy Virgin is made to intervene. The patients are given to drink of the water of the Marne or the Loire, and, with the help of saving faith, a gentle and kindly recovery is induced.

The action on the body of our psychic life manifests itself thus in all forms. The discovery of the vaso-motor nerves, made by Claude Bernard, has enabled us to introduce a little order among the numerous and complicated effects provoked by suggestion both from without and from within (auto-suggestion). We now know the controlling action of the brain, which by means of the vaso-motor nerves has an effect on all our organs. The beating of the heart may become slower, quicker, or may even cease under the stress of emo-

tions such as anger or fear. A very great fright may even cause death through syncope.

Intense attention, concentrated on any portion of our body, provokes manifest changes there. Thus redness or paleness may be induced in the face, or swellings on different parts of the body. Certain monks were found with the red marks of flagellation or with the signs of Christ's suffering, as the result of too prolonged or too often repeated hours of ecstasy. Charcot relates numerous cases of the phenomena of burns or ecchymoses appearing on the bodies of people as a consequence of suggestion directed to that end.

By the aid of simple suggestion we can thus diagnose functional troubles, organic injuries and hemorrhages as well as curative vaso-constriction. The cases of cure by suggestion of the expectoration of blood, and especially of bleeding from the nose (*epistaxis*), are exceedingly frequent. This has been noticed chiefly in connection with loss of blood caused by wounds. Punctures, however deep, in the hypnotic state are never accompanied by a flow of blood.

The ancients, to take Homer's word for it ("Odyssey"), were already familiar with the force of suggestion in this respect. The wily Ulysses, injured by a boar, had recourse to a special incantation in order to stop the blood escaping from his wound. By founding our theories on Claude Bernard's vaso-motor system we are able to explain in the same way a number of other phenomena which we owe to suggestion. Thus, conditions of our mind, its passions and sentiments, cause the strangest reactions on the organism. Faith enables you to cross mountains, as our ancestors used to say. Courage gets the better of the most redoubtable enemies. It is often not the medicines which cure, but the confidence people have in the doctor.

In their most simple expression the passions cause phenomena which are easy to control. Strong emotions give rise to cold sweats, diarrhœa, anæmias, blood poisoning, arrested digestion. Hack Tuke relates the following interesting illustration of the curative effects of a railway catastrophe: a rheumatic subject, seized with a most painful attack of rheumatism, took train in order to go home. His sufferings continued in

their most violent form. A collision occurred, caused the death of one of the travellers in his compartment, and suddenly put an end to all the patient's pains.

It would take whole volumes to state the case for the effect of mind on matter—that is to say, the effect of our ideas, sensations, and sentiments on the body. One incontestable fact nevertheless stands out from the examples cited above—viz., psychic influences frequently produce the same effects as stimulants or mechanical influences.

It would, however, be very difficult to place all the known cases under formal categories, for the simple reason that their number is unlimited. When individual impressionability lends itself to it we might call forth with the help of the psychic factors almost the whole gamut of phenomena yielded by material causes.

What, for instance, could be more disturbing than this singular story reported to me the other day? In a dining-room where there were about twenty people, one of the hosts, brusquely interrupting in a voice choked with strong emotion, shouted: "Alas! we are all poisoned; the cook has gone mad and put arsenic in all the sauces!" Thereupon several people were seized with vomiting, others experienced pains like those of arsenic poisoning, while a woman fell to the ground overcome. . . . The mistake was discovered a few moments later, for the supposed arsenic was only mouldy flour that the drunken cook had mistaken for poison.

Under the influence of severe grief the hair changes color in the space of a night. Certain emotions act in a special way on certain glands. The idea of sorrow experienced provokes tears; rage acts on the salivary glands. Shame produces a reddening of the cheeks just as the feeling of fear affects the functions of the heart and often of the digestive organs. Joy facilitates digestion, while anger poisons the organism and unsettles its primordial functions. On the other hand, serenity of mind quite appreciably induces well-being. In this condition all our organs perform their functions in a way which is nearer the normal, more healthy, and more in accordance with the prosperity of the body.

II

When we consider the undoubted reflex action of the mind on the body, we may easily realize that nature has placed certain means at our disposal for increasing our happiness on the earth. We are somewhat in the position of an owner of land in whose depths lie hidden rich veins of gold. What should we say of such a man who, while aware of his riches, refused to exploit them?

And yet this is the case with almost all human beings. We know how easily handled and how evidently certain are these moral instruments which nature has put into our hands, and yet how many are there who have recourse to them? The properly used forces of our mind may render us important services with regard to the prolongation of our life. As we have shown above, there is no doubt that ill-directed suggestion shortens it. Arrived at a certain age we poison ourselves with the idea of or with thoughts about our approaching end. We lose faith in our own strength, and our strength leaves us. On the pretext that age is weighing heavily on our shoulders, we take to sedentary habits and cease to pursue our occupations with vigor. Little by little our blood, vitiated by idleness, and our feebly renewed tissues open the doors to all sorts of maladies. Precocious old age lays siege to us, and we succumb earlier than we need have done, as a result of injurious auto-suggestion.

Now why should we not endeavor to live by auto-suggestion, instead of dying of it? We might keep before our eyes numerous examples of healthy and robust longevity and let our consciousness be invaded and conquered by the possibility of living beyond a hundred years. Goethe said somewhere: "Man can command nature to eliminate from his being all the foreign elements which cause him suffering and illness." However, negative action is not sufficient. One must also proceed to a positive piece of work. One must store up in one's brain beneficent, serene, and comforting suggestions. Every one knows the fundamental basis of the sect of the "Christian Scientists," so wide-spread in the United States. In face of

an obvious illness, they affirm that it does not exist, and they suggest the idea that prayers can conquer every evil. Up to the period when, blinded by success, the representatives of this new belief pushed their method, which is excellent in itself, beyond the limits of common sense, unnumbered cures were effected by their invocations. These supposed "miracles" brought in thousands of adherents and millions of dollars to Mother Eddy, the celebrated foundress of this religion, which proves so lucrative for its priests.

III

On a closer study of the life of centenarians, we perceive how an optimistic belief in their strength has helped them to bear the weight of their years. Baron Waldeck, who died in Paris in 1875 at the age of 109, never ceased to entertain the "suggestion" that he had still long to live. At the age of 102 he undertook for the firm of Didot, so Pierre Giffard, his biographer, affirms, a three-volume encyclopedia, treating of archæology. Consumed with his idea that the Egyptian civilization descended in a direct line from the Mexican, he extracted from his ardent work reasons for going on living. Born under Louis XV. and having travelled at the time of La Perouse, this man breakfasted with Laharpe and the Abbé Delille, counted Camille Desmoulins among his friends, knew Bonaparte as a sub-orderly officer in Egypt and Thiers as a drawing master, was present at a series of revolutions, and passed away under MacMahon, almost in the plenitude of his intellectual forces.

M. Rigaud, the senior Mayor of France, whom I met during the Exposition of 1900, told me that at the age of 92 he was in the habit of rising at four in the morning and immediately beginning work, after rubbing himself with cold water.

"How about your 92 years?" I asked, smilingly.

"I never look at them," he said good-naturedly.

As a contractor for public works he was still at that period personally superintending his workmen.

One of my friends, a most distinguished Englishman,

M. W., whom, in spite of his 87 years, I am careful not to call an old man, leads as active a life as if he were no more than thirty. I shall never forget a walk of some hours' duration which we took together in order to visit, among other things, on the heights of Montmartre, the studio of L. Dhurmer, one of our greatest pastel painters. With intense curiosity M. W. set to work to study "the secret" of the master's procedure. The painter, who had heard tell of the venerable age of his visitor, said to him respectfully:

"There are no longer any secrets to you, Admiral."

"Don't you rely on that," said M. W., smiling. "I have plenty of time before me, and I may yet come into competition with you."

And, as a matter of fact, in the following year, M. W. renewed the lease of his London house for 99 years.

Mrs. Margaret Neave, who died in 1904 in the island of Guernsey, at her estate Rouge Huyshe, at the age of 111, was by no means cut off, up to the end of her days, from the outside world. She received visitors and questioned them on the affairs of the day. As long as Queen Victoria was alive, she never failed to send her an annual telegram of congratulations on her birthday. The Queen replied with affection and carefully examined the portrait of old Mrs. Neave, just as some women who are soon expecting to be mothers anxiously watch the faces of beautiful children.

Mme. Viardot, the great friend of Tourgeneff, in spite of her advanced age of 84, continues to give singing lessons. To her active life and to the absence of all depressing suggestions she owes her youthfulness of spirit, which makes her one of the most agreeable talkers in Paris. I shall never forget the vivid portraits she sketched for me of some of the celebrated personages she had met on her long journey. And is not "creation" the true gift of youth?

Such was also the case with the beautiful Mme. Scrivaneek, the glorious rival of Déjazet, whom I saw, toward the year 1900, giving lessons and private tutoring, at the age of about 80.

We ought to take a flying view in memory of the celebrated men who, as nonagenarians or centenarians, have always dis-

tinguished themselves by their untiring activity and their faith in "their youth." When we think over their cases, we realize that it was the suggestion of force, the innate conviction that resistance is possible, together with the absence of depressing ideas, which chiefly contributed to the preservation of their health and their prolonged life. So that we see how important it is to shut the door of one's heart, or rather of one's brain, to all injurious ideas as to stingy limits to life. Nature, who created poisons, has also created their antidotes. What, for instance, can be more painful to almost all mortals than the mere thought of inevitable old age? Nearly as many tears have been shed over this necessity as over that of death. For those, alas! who tremble at the dark, are quick to perceive its terrors. And yet this old age, so ill-spoken of and so feared, contains within it unsuspected delights. Everything depends on the angle at which we take up our position for observing and studying it. The author of the Epistles to Lucillus (XII.) goes into ecstasies over its charms. "Apples are not good," he tells us, "until they are beginning to go. The beauty of children appears toward the end. . . . Those who love wine take the greatest pleasure in the last draught they drink. All that is most exquisite in man's pleasures is reserved for the end."

Renan also ("*Discours de réception à l'Académie*") discovered an attractive canvas on which to paint old age, so abhorred of all. "Charming age," he says, "that of the Ecclesiast, the most appropriate to serene gaiety, when one begins to see, after a most laborious day's work, that all is vanity, but also that a number of vain things are worth tasting at leisure."

What a fragrant bouquet of delicious and fortifying herbs might be culled from the delicate thinkers who have meditated long on old age. Try to train yourself in it, and you will taste, little by little, under their influence, the charm of quiet, in the place of the worries of fear. Yet bad suggestions come to us from all sides. We think too much of the diseases of our organs, of the using up of our tissue, and of fatal decrepitude. We distrust our physical and intellectual forces, our memory, our conversational gifts and powers of work. For enemies

to our happiness lie in wait for us everywhere. The necessity for keeping them out by good suggestions, and above all by deliberate auto-suggestion, thus becomes most obvious.

IV

We are more cruel to our own interests than nature has any idea of being. The human organism of which we speak so ill is marvellously solid. Probably there is not a single one of the mechanical inventions, on which we so pride ourselves, which could withstand with such impunity the many senseless shocks to which we subject our body. When one thinks of our way of life, which, from the tenderest age, constantly deranges the numerous wheels of the human machine, one cannot but be filled with admiration at its resisting power. Not content, however, with throwing it out of gear, we speak ill of it endlessly as well. Having used and abused our body for a certain number of years, we are then pleased to pronounce it old, senile, lost. And we proceed to neglect it with an absence of care which effects its ruin. After having suffered for many years from our excesses and our follies, it succumbs under the burden of our gratuitous contempt. And when the injury does not come from its own immediate proprietor, you may be sure that our neighbors, relations, or friends will not fail to throw it in its face. Poor human body! Source of so many joys which beautify, nourish, and sustain our life, it is nevertheless reduced to the *rôle* of a mere laughing-stock. The reproach of having a mind or a consciousness which is either senile or worn out creates in us a feeling of revolt. We cannot bear to have any one daring to doubt their strength or their youth. And yet how many are there who venture to animadvert on a sentence of senility unjustly passed upon them? Indeed, men who have reached a certain age bow all the more before such a reproach and do their best to deserve it.

Our superstitions also have a share of the responsibility here as in all other things. Almost all of us experience that of pseudo-senility. Thus we imagine that at sixty years of age or even earlier our hour of retirement has sounded. From this moment we give up our occupations, our exercise, our

pleasures. We withdraw from life and it in turn withdraws from us. Now physiology is there to demonstrate to us that our organism may yet accomplish *all* the physiological functions of the preceding periods. And if our digestion or some other function is weak or paralyzed, we have not our years to thank, but the bad use to which we have put them. For, what is senility? It is the time of life at which a man, who has only a worn-out organism at his service, must die his natural death. Now this limit, which might theoretically be put at one hundred and fifty or two hundred years, exists even in reality much further off than we venture to believe.

For a proof of this I will take a series of curious statistical tables of deaths from old age in Paris during a period of eleven years, which were drawn up by Dr. A. Block (Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris, 1896). The result shows that even in this city of Paris, which has such an unwholesome effect on people's health and longevity, senility, such as we have just defined it, appears frequently at the age of from eighty to eighty-five, and even some years later. This is how the author shows the number of deaths from senility, for lack of other visible causes:

Year.	80–85.	85–90.	90–95.	95–100.	100 and Over.
1880	393	213	60	10	1
1881	465	177	36	9	2
1882	413	214	48	8	1
1883	454	264	64	15	0
1884	437	221	59	6	1
1885	398	238	63	15	0
1886	447	255	61	11	1
1887	387	262	58	12	0
1888	441	271	75	13	1
1889	555	293	116	32	3
1890	519	307	116	18	■

The critical period for an old man in Paris therefore appears to be between eighty and eighty-five, for in these five years there are the most numerous deaths from senility. The author, in comparing all these facts, arrives at the apparently paradoxical conclusion that from the age of eighty illness has less power over an old man the older he becomes. In other words,

after having passed this critical age, man has more chance of dying of a natural death—that is to say, of crossing the threshold of his centenary. What is the reason of this? It is very simple. It often takes a man eighty years of experience to know how to direct the capacities of his organism with precision.

The most important thing for us is that death from pneumonia, heart disease, and cerebral congestion or hemorrhage, is by no means so frequent after the age of sixty as is ordinarily believed. In other terms, the respiratory apparatus, the circulation, and even the digestive organs continue their functions, or rather they have no special reason for not continuing their functions. In any case, it is not senile decay, a natural cause, which deprives us of their use, but all sorts of accidental causes. Which of us has not met men who have passed the age of eighty and yet digest and breathe very well and are still enjoying all their intellectual faculties?

Rational economy in the use of our organs may preserve them for their work far beyond a century. Often all that is required is that we should be saturated from an early age with this truth in order to enable all who are in love with life to pass beyond this long stage of the journey.

V

Intelligent men have yet another means of prolonging their existence, which the poor in spirit cannot practise. I mean the control of life and its rational use.

In his tract on the "Shortness of Life,"[1] Seneca asserts with reason that "it is not that we have too little time, but we lose so much," and that "the smallest part of our life is the part we live."

From that point of departure he combats the pessimism of Aristotle who poured out recriminations against nature which were hardly worthy of a sage. It is well known that the founder of Peripatetics complained bitterly against the immortal principle of things which had only considered "the animals whose existence was prolonged for five or six cen-

[1] *De brevitate vitæ.* "*Non exiguum temporis habemus, sed multum perdimus.*" . . . "*Exigua pars est vitæ, quam nos vivimus.*"

turies, while man, born for so great and various a destiny, found himself pulled up while still far within these limits." But according to Seneca, long life itself only becomes short because of our inaptitude in using it. And the philosopher makes the profound remark, which has never ceased to be true in spite of the number of centuries which stand between us and its author:

"No man permits any encroachment on his field, and for the smallest dispute about a boundary stones and javelins are let fly, and each suffers his life to be invaded. . . . You cannot find any one who will share his money, yet each lavishes his life on all comers. All attach importance to the management of their patrimony, but, as soon as it becomes a question of loss of time, they are prodigal to excess with the one good thing of which it would be beneficial to be stingy."

In taking up this point of view we see how cruel man is with regard to his own interests. We are all agreed as to the value of life and time, its supreme expression. Yet rare are those who really know how to honor it. Let each one pass in review the months and years lost in vices which shorten our existence, in a sort of moral or intellectual lethargy which ought to be deducted from life, and we can easily see that we are our own executioners. We must not believe in the control exercised by acts of the civil state, nor even in the outward signs of old age. Like the face of a clock, they perform the function of mechanical registration. The hidden truth rarely corresponds to these formal signs. Such and such a white beard or such and such a birth certificate pointing to two or three quarters of a century of human life, may perhaps only correspond to fifteen or twenty years. The squandering of individual lives only finds its equal in that of modern civilization with its armaments and its wars. Let each of us examine his conscience and he will tremble with indignation and horror at the lion's share of his life which has been destroyed by carelessness and lightness. Along with our own errors we must include those of our defective systems of education and instruction.

The illnesses which might have been avoided, as well as

the evils of the education of youth, abstract from life more years than each would require in order to become a centenarian. Thus we see that the science of life, the art of using it intelligently would distinctly prolong its limits. The people who groan at the years which in slipping away bring them nearer the fatal *dénouement* remind one of the prodigals who lament the enforced outlay of a few halfpence, while they are tossing sovereigns out of the window.

How true is the neat saying of Charron: "It is characteristic of a great master to enclose much in a little space." It is perhaps in this quarter that we might easily find one of the numerous keys to long life.

VI

But how are we to counteract the depressing influences which lie in wait for us every moment of our lives? Consider the evil and the good, and what do we find? It is often quite enough for some one to tell us some thing nice and pleasant to produce a condition of peace and serenity in our minds. More important still: often in the grip of analytical melancholy or of unlimited despair we sit down to think over our case. After careful examination we find it by no means so exasperating. If we continue our thinking the calmer aspects of the event stand out with reassuring clearness. They even smile at us good-naturedly, and we may confidently abandon ourselves to their tender mercies. Thus unhappy impressions fade away, injurious or depressing sentiments become less acute, and, just as the surface of a lake which has been disturbed by the invasion of some body from outside regains its habitual stillness, so our conscious mind regains its equilibrium. For, in nature, there is nothing either absolutely good or absolutely bad. In the saddest things there is an element of sweetness, if not of gayety. It is our business to seek it, and having found it to make good use of it.

A wise man will do still more. Instead of having recourse, on special occasions, to this beneficent fairy, he will wish to keep her always close to him. Looking into her smiling face,

he will acquire renewed strength for each misfortune. He will let life's furrows be smoothed away by her musical laughter. Cross-grained philosophers and psychologists will no doubt say that this is optimism unworthy of superior men. What does that matter? We may say what evil we like of optimism, but we must admit all the same that it is closely bound up with the fortunes of human beings. It is all very well to try to substitute the philosophy of ill-temper, in other words, gnawing pessimism, as the natural system of humanity. We have only to examine a man a little nearer and to observe with what joy he entertains the smiles of the good fairy and turns from the grimaces of pessimism to see which way nature draws him. If we cast a look round us we notice how instinctively a man lets himself be drawn along by his own optimistic tendencies. The many games of chance with their risks bordering on the unlikely; the thronging of the liberal professions where success is rare; the faith in political panaceas, and the spectacle of so many other of the games of life where impregnable belief in a happy issue constantly dominates the fear of misfortune all go to prove it. Humanity left to itself, as Dr. Max Nordau says somewhere, gives way by preference and by instinct to happy influences. Consequently these have more chance of possessing us. All we need is to utilize them for our own happiness.

I cannot contemplate the vast fields of international literature without emotion.

Millions of people of the writing profession make a living out of the misery and scorn of the public and the critics. Yet they continue to introduce their works often at the cost of appalling injuries to their self-respect. In their robust faith in the future they discount the glory of to-morrow and even that due to them from far-off generations. And yet they cannot ignore the fact that out of the thousands of works and of writers who preceded us, not more than a few hundreds have survived. In comparison with the chances which we have in the lottery of literary glory, a share in the Panama or the Crédit Foncier of Paris might almost be considered a certainty of a big haul.

What has become of the greatest poets of Greece? Which of us has ever read a single line of Simonides, who was fifty-six times a winner in the prize competitions; or of Philetas, whom Theocritus despaired of ever equalling? Max Bonnet, in his "Classical Philology," argues that Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides have only survived because they have been made subjects for the practical studies of our youth! This is how the glory of these immortal poets is maintained from among all the men who had the opportunity of living in an epoch when, as is said, mankind was not suffering from any embarrassment of talent or genius. Were it not for our rooted optimism the millions of writers who spring up all over the world would no doubt snap their pens and take to more peaceful and, O irony supreme! more durable work. Thus there is nothing easier than to reach the port of happiness by trusting one's self to optimist currents.

Yet those who feel incapable of putting this comforting philosophy in practice may have recourse to a surprisingly simple method. It is none the less efficacious. Every one knows the story of the sick man, who, while suffering from neuralgia, argued so well with his pain that it finally disappeared. What is required is auto-suggestion for each given case, instead of falling back on some general doctrine. Does not psychotherapeutics, the new departure in medicine, teach us that certain illnesses disappear as if by enchantment as the result of constantly repeated suggestions? Dr. F. Régnault relates that in treating a hypochondriac he advised him to write on the wall every evening the words, "I am happy," and to go off to sleep in full view of them. After a few weeks happiness began to steal into his spirit. Which of us, in speaking of God, does not instinctively turn toward the sky? Neither science nor reason can prevail against the mechanical repetition of the phrase, which is yet so contrary to the most elementary notions of astronomy: "Our Father, which art in Heaven." In moments of distress, astronomers themselves may be found seeking for their God in some hidden corner of the universe!

VII

What endless resource is provided in this way against the invading years! Let us accept them with confidence and look on them with the softness which befits men of wisdom. Let us ever keep before our eyes comforting examples of serene old age and probable longevity. Little by little our optimistic visions will become a guard of honor. They will be on the watch that poisonous fears do not take possession of our consciousness. Those who are not sensitive to this surrounding atmosphere of reasoned thought may, on the other hand, have recourse to direct and repeated suggestion. Let us then repeat every day and at every moment when the fears of helpless old age come back to memory, first of all that it is a long way off, and secondly let us remind ourselves of its attractions. This direct action on the mind will have extraordinary results. And as the hypochondriac comes to be always smiling by continually telling himself that he is happy, so people obsessed by the thought of old age and death may be restored to calm at their approach.

Our unreasoned fears, by demoralizing our minds, only accelerate their destructive advance. In facing them with the careful consideration worthy of a well-informed man, we remove our limits. Our apprehensions are put to sleep under the influence of thought just as, according to the Indians, the evil desires of love are by *malalis*.

Let us especially put ourselves under the most powerful influence of all, that of work. Let us prolong our youth under the protection of these illusions. Let us use our minds rather than enfeeble our bodies for want of occupation. In a word, let us not give ourselves time to grow old!

The inevitable visitation which must at some time lead in the two dreaded sisters, old age and death, will not only take place later, but, what is more essential, will become a thing almost to be desired. They will be awaited like guests who are to bring us at some distant, even at some very distant, day, the attractive charm of their sweet and peaceful melancholy.

XXXIX

THE HOPE

"THE UNKNOWN GOD"

BY

SIR HENRY THOMPSON

WE approach the close of our series. We have faced life from many sides, examined it in many aspects. From the immaterial side, the side of creation, of godhood, and of mystery, we are perhaps ready to ask ourselves the final question, What shall we, what can we, what at heart do we believe of an existence beyond and above us? Upon this mighty subject each individual has meditated perforce, with whatsoever of profundity and earnestness lies within his nature. Positive conclusions, drawn partly perhaps from an inherited faith, partly from a limited personal experience, are held by some among us with a passionate intensity which defies doubt almost as a crime. Others cry clamorously to their neighbors for fuller light. Others have pushed the question aside impatiently as beyond solution. What, let us ask ourselves, would a thoughtful man believe who had seen all life and studied all religions without, if such a case were possible, a preconceived partiality for any one among them? What in brief will the man of the future believe when he has come to know all that may be knowable on earth?

The first of these two questions we can answer partly, though not the second. We have here the words of a man famous in the annals of medicine, a noted English physician who until his recent death was not only a leader in his profession but a man of mark in the social world, a diplomat and "friend of kings." Sir Henry Thompson ranked as "physician extraordinary"

to more than one of the crowned heads of Europe. He was not a professional writer, but early in life he began that serious and untrammelled search into religion which here finds such striking literary expression. This summing up in a strictly logical way of the conclusions he had finally reached was Sir Henry's last important work, his legacy to the world. That he does not literally accept Christianity need afflict no Christian mind. Rather should each one draw encouragement from the fact that while wholly ignoring "revelation" this profound investigator has reached results so close akin to all its teachings.

An attempt to seek, by a carefully made induction from available data, some certain assurance respecting the influence which the "Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed" has exercised on Man throughout his long career on Earth.

"But amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the absolute certainty that he (the Astronomer) is ever in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed."—HERBERT SPENCER, *Nineteenth Century Review*, Jan., 1884.

I

I SUPPOSE there can be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent student of Nature, by which term is to be understood the numerous and multiform phenomena which any and every part of the Universe within his reach presents, that careful investigation inevitably leads to a conviction that all are subject to a uniform order and regularity in their varied operations. And this regularity is to be regarded as applying to all such phenomena, whether they be only mechanical movements of inert matter, or those more complicated forms of activity associated with what is termed—but not yet understood—as "Life," either in the animal or vegetable world. For an example, let us consider that magnificent array which we call the "Heavens," concerning which it is well known that millions of stars are individually identified and registered by the astronomer, and that each is a central sun, more or less like our own, pursuing a rapid course, absolutely uniform and therefore calculable, so that its exact position in the sky can be predicted for any future

minute of time, even (say) in the next century. No less ordered in its movement is each of the smaller orbs constituting our own solar system; the eclipse of one by the intervening passage of another, or, may be, only by a shadow cast upon it in its course, being predicable with like certainty years before the event occurs.

One more example, but from the no less wonderful and extensive world of the exceeding small. A competent observer may, on seeing attached to a certain leaf a minute ovum, be able infallibly to predict the future career of the animal which will emerge therefrom, its coming changes in size and form, the duration of its existence, and the fact that it will assuredly give rise to other beings like itself. Hundreds of like illustrations might be adduced, but the above amply suffice for the present purpose.

II

Familiar with the apparently universal presence of a uniform order dominating the operations of all that is understood as Matter, roughly classed as organic and inorganic, it is almost impossible to conceive our observer capable of resisting a conviction that some marvellous source of Energy exists behind, or is immanent in, the "Universe," accepting this as an appropriate term by which to denote the sum total of all the phenomena within our reach. And thus the idea is naturally and strongly suggested, that what he knows as ordered arrangement as exercised among men is manifested in Nature, but with a more complete and far greater certainty and stability of result in the latter case. For "Man" being himself, beyond all question, the most perfect example of intelligent activity known to man, must necessarily be the type or measure by which he can attempt to estimate any other manifest source of analogous activity, however infinitely greater than himself, and conceived by him as the paramount and ever-present origin or Cause of all Existence.

Let me then venture in pursuing this inquiry to suggest that the "Infinite and Eternal Energy" thus postulated as the productive source of all Natural phenomena may be regarded by

man, notwithstanding his necessarily limited purview, as to a certain extent analogous—being dissimilar rather in the transcendent vastness of its scope than in the mode—with that by which a human will is exercised. This being granted, I cannot but conclude that the unknown source may, and can only, be studied, with the view of acquiring any knowledge respecting its nature, by the single method or instrument which man has hitherto employed to acquire all the knowledge he has obtained during the long period of his existence in this world, viz., by the careful study of phenomena, and by collecting all data respecting them which are proved to be absolute facts. These being collated and carefully considered, may in time enable him to infer, with more or less certainty, the existence of manifest tendencies, denoting the possession of attributes or disposition manifested by the Unknown Power, and furnishing data capable of being appreciated or described as exercising a beneficial influence, or the reverse, on the Human Race, and also upon all lower forms of Animal Life.

III

But perhaps it might here be urged, Why not avoid the circumlocution involved by referring to a possible Supreme Cause of all things in such terms as "Infinite and Eternal Energy," or the like, and adopt one of the brief words which have been in general use, as "Jehovah," "Theos," "Jove," or "God"? I reply that they are avoided precisely because each of them has become so completely identified by long association of ideas with schemes of theological doctrine based on the alleged existence of personal appearances on the earth of the beings thus named, founded on ancient legends which have served without doubt as useful provisional working hypotheses during the early ages of man's history, but for the scientific inquirer, *i.e.*, the patient seeker after truth, are necessarily replaced by less defined and more abstract terms. For, as we have seen, no human mind can entertain, much less express, any definite idea of the nature or attributes pertaining to the Source of all power, "Infinite and Eternal," without conveying at the same

time the idea of a Being or Personality; man's conceptions being limited by his knowledge of the highest achievements of his own race. Hence the universal use of anthropomorphic symbols, and the necessary formation of inadequate corresponding ideas, respecting the vast, inscrutable, and unknown source and origin of all things; whence an "eidolon" results, no better than those which have been carved by the hands of every race in its early history, possessing none but the crudest legends derived from necessarily ignorant ancestry. And thus every man to-day who has imbibed any idea of a material semblance representing in his mind a personal "God," conditioned by terms expressive of human attributes, has but made an idol for himself. And no two such men can ever by any possibility make the same; each of these impressions or concepts must be that of the individual alone, and from the very nature of things no two can be alike.

To return then to the subject of our proposed inquiry: there is but one mode of prosecuting it to its farthest extent with the faculties which man at present possesses, viz., the patient diligent examination of natural phenomena on a large scale. And let it be remarked here that by the phenomena of the Universe, or Nature, are to be understood not only those impressions on our senses which arise by contact with what is understood as the external world, but also those impressions which are derived from a study of what we know as our own consciousness—a distinction without a difference, retained in deference to popular habits of thought, since every acquisition of knowledge involves an act of consciousness.

In this way and by this alone can we be sure of attaining our object, at all events to some extent. It is impossible to comprehend the vastness and sublimity of the idea which the terms "illimitable space" and "endless time" express; although doubtless strictly applicable to the source of the Infinite and Eternal Energy, concerning the nature and tendencies of which we but crave, if possible, humbly to learn something more than heretofore, by the mode of inquiry already suggested. An object which beyond all others is, perhaps, the sublimest and most attractive which our life and its surroundings can offer.

IV

We will next consider the question, What has Man acquired during his long career by the so-called Supernatural revelations alleged to have been communicated to him by a supreme and all-powerful Deity?

Whatever he may have learned, "at sundry times and in divers manners," by means of "Divine Revelation," this fact at least must be universally admitted, viz., that the single object of all of them has been to inculcate Religious and Moral duties. The Religious duties have consisted chiefly in demanding constant and humble service to an Omnipotent Deity, one God, of whom, taking the words attributed to the Founder of Christianity as a command, he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment" (Matthew c. xxii., v. 37, 38)—a service the neglect of which, according to the tenets of Christianity, entails the severest punishment, not in the present, but in a future and eternal hell; while a never-ending life of supreme happiness is promised as the reward of faithful obedience.

The Moral obligations enforced, that is, the conduct of Man to his fellows, are signified and enunciated by impressive exhortations to charity and kindness to the poor and afflicted. The passage above quoted continues as follows: "And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matthew c. xxii., v. 39). Then follow the significant words, so opposed to the oppressive ceremonial of the ancient Jewish usages then in force: "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets" (v. 40).[1]

Subsequently Christianity, organized by the great Teacher's immediate followers, who were Greeks speaking and writing that language, took the form of the Greek or Eastern Church during the second century of our era. The doctrines of Christianity are still taught in that tongue throughout Russia, where it is the National Church to this day. From this source the

[1] Revised Version used throughout.

Romish Church arose, and allying itself to the Imperial power the Bishop of Rome soon became the Pope, and an infallible head of the Catholic Church, requiring absolute obedience in all matters of faith and practice from her adherents. In England the Reformed or Protestant Religion is the National Church; and notwithstanding its evident and admitted defects, its inevitable division into numerous hostile sects, differing seriously respecting matters of belief, it has doubtless been in past ages well suited to the nations who have embraced it and have been influenced thereby. Thus the establishment of public hospitals and other institutions for the care of the poor and afflicted are found among the European races who have adopted the religious faith which is identified chiefly with the young Jewish devotee whose history, although imperfectly known as to matters of detail, affords little ground for doubt that he taught his followers very little or no dogma, but simply the worship of One God, "His Father"—and "Theirs" also—the practice of kindness, truth, self-denial and of a simple and blameless life; and that he set them the example of going about doing good to others, even to their enemies.

And such charity and care for the suffering is held in all parts of the world to be the duty of Man, wherever he has become civilized, as we shall hereafter see. And let it be added here once and for all, that each of the varied forms of Religion which have appeared on earth, although claiming to be supernaturally revealed, must be regarded as the natural outcome of Man's own wants and feelings, the sense of his desire to recognize a Power above him—"One that is greater than I"—worthy to be worshipped; trusted in for help in time of need, for justice when oppressed; One that might hear his prayers and accept his sacrifice. All have been useful aids in his progress, and have arisen as the natural result of his own development.

A brief sketch of the chief religions which have thus arisen in the later ages of the world's history may follow here. That with which we in this country are necessarily most familiar, by no means the oldest in point of date, is believed to have originated among the ancient Semitic race, and was known as Judaism, still largely prevalent, but modified at a comparatively re-

cent date, that adopted to mark our own era A.D., by the outgrowth and separation of an important and powerful religious organization and creed, which has been already noticed, Christianity, now accepted by the greater part of Europe and its dependencies and by the United States of America. The most ancient of all known to us is the system of religious worship and rites of early Egypt, of which interesting records exist dating certainly to 5,000 B.C. After these should be named the religions of Babylonia and Assyria, which follow Egypt closely in respect of antiquity. An ancient lawgiver in China, Confucius, who flourished about 550 B.C., was remarkable for his honest and upright rule, led a virtuous life, and had many disciples. He sought knowledge from every available source, and after death his acts and sayings were collected by them in several books, the chief of which is his "Code of Morals," which contained among many other precepts the precise words of the Golden Rule of Christian Scripture. But he taught nothing respecting a god or religious worship. The ancient religion of the Persians, now that of the Parsees, was to a great extent founded by Zoroaster, who lived at least 800–900 years B.C., possibly earlier. Subsequently it became related in some degree with Sanskrit. Its ancient writings form "the Zend Avesta" or commentaries. One great and good creator was recognized ("Ormuzd"), regarded as dual at a later period, whose emblem was fire; and evil spirits headed by ("Ahriman"), the spirit of evil, opposed him. Numerous sacrifices and penances were enforced; strict purity of life was held essential in all the disciples of the faith. Somewhat later is the religion of Buddha, which possesses the largest number of followers of any religion in the world. Its origin dates from about 500 B.C., when its founder, a royal prince in Northern India (Prince Saddhartha), devoted himself to an ascetic life and contemplation, and to a study of the causes of things, regarding ignorance as the greatest evil. The records made by his adherents became sacred books, and the cult flourishes not only in India, but throughout a large part of China. It suffices only to mention briefly the religious Hierarchies of ancient Greece and Rome, constituted by large groups of deities, some arising out

of historic legends. The divinities so-called of Greece were especially represented as exhibiting all the follies and vices of humanity. Those of Rome were related rather with the needs of husbandry, or of the shepherd and his flocks—as well as those of the house and the family: hence the "Lares and Penates." For the former the Greek poets and satirists had little respect; while the philosophers derided the rites and ceremonies which were largely performed by the common people, but they inculcated the advantages of a good life as acceptable to the Gods.[1] Of any future state their views were at first indistinct, but gradually a belief was established in some system of future rewards and punishments after death. There were no sacred books, and any idea of an evil spirit or devil was unknown. More recent than Christianity was the advent of Mahometanism (570–622 A.D.), in the divine origin of which its followers have the profoundest belief, adducing ample evidence thereof. It is more closely allied to Christianity than any other, since it recognizes one supreme God as the "Only God," together with the claims of Moses and the Jewish prophets, even those of Jesus Christ himself, to have received Divine authority; thenceforth, however, to be superseded by the Prophet. To its later date may perhaps be attributed his wise laws and regulations, which are minutely recorded in the Koran, and contain numerous incentives to the constant practice of charity, mercy, and kindness. Moreover, he absolutely proscribed the use of all intoxicating liquors, and also of betting and gambling, two vices which are disastrously prominent in all Christian countries.

V

I propose now to make a brief outline of the history of Man's long and painful progress while slowly acquiring knowledge of the objects by which he has been surrounded, that is to say,

[1] Socrates, born 469 B.C., concerned himself with Ethics, and taught that virtue is knowledge and vice is ignorance; Plato, born 427 B.C., was the master of Aristotle, born 384 B.C. Both taught that goodness and truth are among the highest virtues, although the latter differed in many other things from his master.

of the numerous and varied conditions and influences to which the course of Nature has everywhere exposed him; and thus to demonstrate that he has attained his present position solely by his own unaided efforts. For as before stated it is certain that no record exists to show that any divine or supernatural revelation has ever afforded man aid or instruction in matters relating to his physical well-being during the laborious course he has pursued throughout countless ages of tardy and difficult progress, from the earliest savage life to the present day. Every advantage has taken place by the gradual improvement of his faculties through the development of a more complex brain through lower forms, until it has attained its present condition, with capability of increase in coming ages to an unknown extent.

Man at first acquired an activity of brain and nervous system not possessed by those of his progenitors, now termed "Anthropoid Apes." These had gradually assumed a more or less upright position for special purposes of the body, thus differentiating the four legs of a lower animal into upper and lower extremities each employed for special and distinctive service. These large apes usually took shelter among the lofty branches of large forest trees, and lived chiefly on fruit and nuts, with now and then eggs and young birds. Like them, man probably at first used similar food, but in course of time added thereto the flesh of wild animals trapped in the forest and fish caught in the streams. Exposed to cold, wind, tempests, and inundations, he made himself clothes from the skins of the animals he learned to kill, and inhabited natural caverns which he probably excavated or improved for himself; at first, perhaps, by using for the purpose portions of the branches of trees blown down by the wind. Or of these he might also construct rude huts to protect himself and his young ones from the elements, and from the attacks of carnivorous foes of many kinds. He would soon learn to make long pointed stakes of hard wood, to be used as weapons for defence or to kill animals for food. Abundant evidence exists in many parts of the world that in prehistoric times flints were utilized as cutting instruments for such and other purposes; at first being rudely broken into thin flakes so as to produce a sharp edge. These have been found in

great quantity, some of them very skilfully made, in caverns and in other places of deposit. When the use of the bow as an instrument of propulsion for killing prey and in fighting had been discovered, it was rendered more efficient by tipping the arrows with sharp flint points as arrow-heads. From very large flints were also fashioned axes for cutting wood, etc., and for weapons. They were attached to wooden handles by a strip of hardened animal hide. Some of these flint instruments were ultimately made with serrated edges for use as saws. The bones of small animals were utilized for making needles and other finely pointed instruments.

The Flint Age was succeeded by the discovery of copper and by the use of bronze, of which weapons and utensils were thenceforth largely made, and used almost universally for several centuries; to be superseded by the discovery in modern times of iron, and its conversion into steel for appliances of all kinds as at present.

The process by which man acquired the first rudiments of the great faculty of speech must have been a very gradual one. The earliest attempts probably consisted in improving upon the rude sounds, and even musical notes, by which the lower animals expressed tender emotions to their mates, and approached the rival or the enemy with loud and angry cries, which signified displeasure or even a challenge to combat. Language of a primitive kind followed, and took the place of signs, as association with his fellows slowly improved by experience; while the growth of family ties, often apparent among some of the lower animals, became naturally more highly developed by man, and the aggregation of families on some fertile or sheltered spot gave rise to the formation of a small community. These increased in size, until the larger combination of a tribe resulted, leading to the adoption of customs gradually acquired to promote the common welfare. By this means the principle of sacrificing a certain portion of personal liberty by each individual, for the good of the "commonwealth," was gradually discovered to be a wise arrangement and to promote the happiness of all. Man became social in his habits, and—without knowing it—learned the first lesson not only in law, but in ethics, the value

of self-denial for the good of all. And it is worthy of note that each tribe, in course of time, generally became provided with its local Deity, and with some rudimentary form of religious worship.

Thus, various languages naturally arose in different parts of the world. The common objects daily seen, by the members of each tribe or community, would be identified by a sound or word, suggested perhaps by the appearance of the object, and adopted in order to denote it. All the first words were therefore nouns; and by the same process their qualities came to be indicated, and adjectives were employed to describe them. Action had to be expressed, and verbs came into use; applicable to the past, present, and future in respect of deeds. While articles and pronouns appeared, for obvious purposes, and so on. In this manner a spoken literature was formed, and was transmitted as "hearsay" from father to son, in the forms of tradition, story, proverb, or song. Long after, written symbols were invented and the permanence of these traditions provided for. Much interesting light on man's early history has been obtained by modern scientific researches in connection with ancient languages. The rights of personal ownership must have been recognized at an early period in man's social history. The maker of a flint axe or the builder of a hut would naturally be entitled to regard these as belonging to him for his own exclusive use, and the idea of property came to be realized. Then the mode of transferring of property from one owner to another had to be provided for. At first it was by barter only—a custom at present still extant among savage tribes. Then, as the community increased, some "common medium of exchange" was found, through objects generally prized, as skins, cowrie shells, etc., etc. It became necessary next to find some article which could be adopted as "a measure of value," and also one which could be stored without depreciation in quality; which led to the use of the precious metals, gold and silver, copper and bronze being employed for articles of small value; and ultimately to the circulation of portions of each metal—known weights—as coins, and stamped as such by the chief authority.

The discovery of fire, and the power of producing it at will, must have marked an epoch in his early history; friction between two pieces of hard wood is known to have been practised for the purpose of producing it by the isolated savage inhabitants of distant islands in the Pacific, discovered by some early navigator some centuries ago. And continuous light was provided for by rude oil lamps, which as well as common drinking-vessels were made of a primitive form of pottery.

Agriculture, in an elementary form, became an occupation at a very early period, by the sowing of seeds which produced edible vegetables; and selection of the seed-bearing grasses, by cultivation of the best growths, led in the course of years to the production of the grains now known as rye, oats, wheat, maize, rice, etc. Meantime the gradual domestication and breeding of animals for flesh and milk as food, and also for employment in draught, such as of carts on rollers and rude wheels, etc., increased man's resources considerably. The hollow trunks of trees were utilized, and trimmed into shape, to form canoes and boats; and these were equipped with sails when the art of weaving mats from dried wide-leaved plants from marshy soils had been attained.

Not only by sailors for the purpose of navigation at night, but by the shepherds with their flocks on extensive plains, attentive observations to the course of the sun and moon by day, and of the greater stars by night served the purpose of timekeeping. And the sun's rays by day were made to record themselves automatically, by marking the process of a shadow from an upright stake in the ground—a rudimentary dial. These early attempts were followed by careful observers among the Chaldæans, Chinese, and Hindoos. The first mentioned, probably some 3,000 years B.C., named the chief stars and grouped some of the constellations, divided the day into hours, etc. The Ptolemaic system followed, and is a record of researches first made by Hipparchus, the Greek philosopher (about 150 B.C.), by Ptolemy of Alexandria (middle of second century A.D.), who extended his predecessor's work and left voluminous records which more or less maintained their influence until the appearance of the great mediæval observers, soon to follow.

Here it may be appropriate to recall the fact that up to a comparatively recent period the Western nations universally regarded the earth as a large circular plain with an undulating surface, forming the centre of the universe. Those especially who were acquainted with the records known to us as "Sacred Writ," learned from it that the "Heavens above" formed the special dwelling-place of "Jehovah," "God" of the universe, surrounded by ministering angels who executed His will, often indeed appearing in bodily form to man to announce His behests. From the same source he learned also that, on the fourth day of creation, "God made two great lights"; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the "stars also" (Gen., chap. i., v. 16). All these were supposed to be fixed in "a firmament" which revolved round the earth, the latter having no movement of any kind.

Below this plain, at an unknown but not great depth, there was a region of gloom, which the spirits of the dead inhabited, known as "Sheol"; from which by means of the "Seer," they could sometimes be recalled to earth in order to foretell events; since a few of those who, during life, had been distinguished as favorites of Jehovah were believed to be capable of so doing.

The very "recent period" named above may be more distinctly indicated by devoting a few lines to define the views of three of the principal early astronomers.

Copernicus (1473–1543 A.D.) believed the sun was always at rest, and formed the centre of the universe; that the earth was a spherical body, which, with other planets, moved round it, but revolved on its own axis, thus causing day and night. He had no idea of the importance of the stars, but regarded them as lesser lights at an uncertain distance.

Tycho Brahe (1546–1601 A.D.), who believed that the sun moved around the earth, will be named as holding a distinguished position in the annals of the science. He had a noble observatory well furnished with instruments, and gave an impulse to astronomical studies.

Galileo (1564–1642) was the first to employ an arrangement of lenses, for the purpose of forming an astronomical telescope, by which means he discovered the Milky Way to be formed of

separate stars. He afterward openly taught at Rome his belief in the rotation of the earth on its axis, and its annual passage round the sun; and was in consequence summoned before the Holy Inquisition, and was tortured and imprisoned when seventy years of age for persisting in his opinion, but he was ultimately set at liberty by the succeeding Pope.

It now only remains to be said that unceasing and intelligent study and greatly improved telescopes in every part of the civilized world, aided by the recently discovered arts of photography and spectrum-analysis, have led to the astonishing results achieved during the nineteenth century.

The astronomical discoveries which, as above observed, man's own unaided labors have achieved, demonstrate beyond all possibility of doubt that the so-called Mosaic records, above quoted, are quite untrustworthy. Nevertheless, they are still accepted by all Christian Churches, and are publicly read, in turn with other extracts equally questionable, twice or thrice a week as "Holy Scripture." The earth is now known to be an insignificant speck, a mere atom of dust in the universe, and that the millions of stars, visible with any good telescope, are suns like our own, many being much larger, and that these are almost certainly surrounded by encircling planets; since spectrum-analysis has proved that the same chemical elements which are so active in every part of our own system, are also the components of every one of the rest within our ken. Now it is impossible for any one familiar with scientific chemistry to conceive that those potent elements oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, nitrogen, carbon, calcium, sodium, the metals, and the rest, can be present there without activity. Hence we are impelled to believe that the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms are in course of development in each of those innumerable systems, and will become active with the stage of fitness, varying, of course, according to the temperature at which each in its history has arrived; a certain very moderate range only of heat being compatible with the existence of vegetable and animal life. Hence it is impossible not to believe that a large proportion are inhabited by organisms more or less akin to those which flourish here. We, in our little home of earth, may well be devoutly

humble in presence of the grandeur of the universe, and in the still greater grandeur of the Author, if we may descend for a moment to the use of an anthropomorphic term to designate the Power of whom nothing can be truly known but by the study of the phenomena around us.

VI

I shall not furnish in detail any further history of Man's progress to illustrate what he has accomplished by his own unaided efforts; but shall simply enumerate, in a tabular form, some of the chief results which he has achieved thereby:

I. All that is comprehended under the general term of "Fine Arts"—painting, sculpture, architecture, metal-work, fictile products, pottery, etc.

II. The discovery of gravitation, and the laws[1] which govern force. At a later period, the conservation of energy.

III. The discovery of the laws of light, heat, and sound.

IV. All that is comprehended by the science of chemistry, and its innumerable practical applications to every department of human activity.

V. The discovery of the existence and of the laws of electricity, the utility of which it is already impossible to overestimate.

The word "Law," as used here and in other parts of this essay, has always the restricted sense of implying any ordinary sequence of events which a faithfully observed experience has led man to believe will continue. As Huxley says in his well-known "Essay on Decartes": "'Law' means a rule which we have always found to hold good, and which we expect always will hold good." . . . He further observes—explaining that all knowledge is relative to the individual, and that all the phenomena of Nature are known to us only as facts of consciousness—that the conclusions logically drawn from them are always verified by experience. (*Vide* Decartes, *Discourse on Using One's Reason Rightly*, etc." Huxley's *Collected Works*, vol. i., pp. 176 and 193.)

"Thus the belief in an unchanging order—the belief in *law*, now spreading among the more cultivated throughout the civilized world, is a belief of which the primitive man is absolutely incapable. He is unable even to think of a single law, much less of law in general." —Herbert Spencer, *Princ. of Psychology*, § 488.

VI. The sciences of animal physiology, botany, and medicine; the microscope in connection therewith; the discovery of the circulation of the blood; of the functions of the brain and nervous system; the laws of health and the nature and cause of disease. The omnipresent activity and importance of bacteria, with all that is understood as sanitary science; the latter having had immense influence on the art of surgery, and enormously increasing the service it is capable of rendering to suffering humanity.

VII. Man's knowledge of the condition of the earth and of its inhabitants in prehistoric time, as learned by palæontological research, *i.e.*, the discovery of the remains of animals which lived many thousands or even millions of years ago, and found in stratified deposits far below the present surface. A science at present in its infancy, so small a portion of the earth's crust having been yet explored.

PART II

I have now finished that part of my work which has been devoted to the object of demonstrating two important statements:

First, that Man has, throughout a long and very gradual course of development from his pre-historic origin, acquired all his stores of natural knowledge—in its widest sense—solely by his own unaided efforts.

Secondly, that the authenticity of the ancient records, existing in several parts of the world, made at different periods of his history, and regarded as supernatural or "divinely" revealed, respecting the origin of the entire universe, especially that of the earth, including man himself and his duties to an alleged Creator, and asserting the existence of a future endless state of rewards and punishments for every individual after death, has never been substantiated, and is in fact unsupported by evidence.

VII

I now arrive at the interesting and important stage of our inquiry: What does our survey of man's history and ex-

perience, and of his relations to the phenomena of nature, teach us respecting the Tendencies, Disposition, and Purpose —if permitted to use terms suggested by purely human feelings and ideas to convey a meaning which cannot be otherwise expressed—manifested by that "Infinite and Eternal Energy" from which all things proceed? This inquiry has exercised the minds of many; nay more, has been an absorbing study for the thinking part of mankind from very early times to the the present. Hypotheses and speculations innumerable, some of which were at first crude and obviously untenable, need not be referred to further now. The fact which alone concerns us here is, that they evince the existence of a deep interest in an all-prevading desire to solve, if possible, the mighty problem here presented.

I declare my firm belief, and desire to repeat it, that one method alone can throw light on the subject, viz., a studious observation of the facts of nature and of the inferences which may be legitimately drawn from them.

I shall consider what we may thus attempt to discover respecting the "Source of Infinite and Eternal Energy" under three heads, regarding each as a form of its manifestation, viz.:

I. Infinite Power.

II. Infinite Knowledge.

III. Tendencies or Disposition.

I. Power; beyond man's faculties to grasp or comprehend. Eternal and all-pervading, therefore ever-present, wherever we may be, at every instant of our lives. In a certain sense by no means invisible, for its working is everywhere around us and within us, in every molecule of our bodies; in the curiously and beautifully arranged adaptations, not yet half discovered, by which we come into contact with external nature—the "not our self"—which meets us everywhere. Let me repeat that it is a fact beyond controversy, always to be borne in mind, that Man is the most finished product known on earth of "Nature's" work—that is, which has resulted from the "Infinite and Eternal Energy"; the noblest and completest manifestation, so to speak, of the "divine afflatus"—the "Temple of the Holy Ghost" in ancient language, used with undesigned prophetic purview

in times when men were ignorant of Nature's laws, and when faith in the Invisible must necessarily suffice for their needs, until discovery of scientific methods had revealed the existence of hitherto unknown powers within and around us; facts in place of fables. Then much which was formerly invisible is now visible; and we might adopt for ourselves the old expressive but mystic saying of "the Master," "Behold the kingdom of God is within you."

II. Infinite Knowledge and Intelligence.—We possess no language adequate to express what must be the deep conviction of all religious persons—and even of men in general, if they consider the question—respecting this subject. By far the greater part of the present essay has been really devoted to illustrating the transcendent Intelligence which has ordered the organization of the Universe, so far as we know and are able to understand it; and I have no stronger terms in which to express admiration. Nothing then remains but to bow in humility, and confess in the words of the Hebrew poet, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me: it is high, I cannot attain unto it" (Ps. cxxxix. v. 6).

III.—The third and last subject of inquiry is, What can we rightly infer relatively to the Tendencies, Disposition or Purpose[1] of the unknown "Source of Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed"?

I shall first revert to the unquestionable fact, on which I laid so much stress, and so fully illustrated at the commencement, of the history of Man's career and progress in this world—that it had been accomplished solely by "his own unaided efforts."

For it constitutes the most important fact in his history; and is for me a signal illustration not only of the wisdom but especially of the beneficence of the great Source we are studying. Nevertheless, the first and most natural feeling suggested by a survey of that long and difficult course which man has traversed through countless ages, may be for many one of pity—with a sense of regret that, had it been possible, aid should not

[1] Applying these terms as we should to the action of human beings; an analogy which must be permitted to Man's limited means of expression.

now and then have been proffered, perhaps at certain turning points in his history, when apparently it would have been greatly serviceable. And not a few have expressed inability to believe in the beneficent tendencies of the Unknown Source of all power, and have inferred evidence of neglect, or of indifference, in regard to man's progress and welfare.

But, on the other hand, it is next to certain that had the human race received at any time a revelation, say, of the means of obtaining fire, or of the elements of agriculture, or of the means of obtaining complete relief from suffering which modern science has discovered, man would never have become the efficient and highly endowed creature he is. He has fought his own way throughout, has overcome every obstacle himself, and passed through an educational course of the most perfect kind—self-taught, not "helped."

The result of this survey of man's long struggle with the forces of Nature, so often apparently hostile, but which he has so completely dominated and rendered subservient to his will and conducive to his well-being, has, I believe, established a fact which affords a complete and decisive proof of the beneficent tendency exercised by the Source of the Infinite and Eternal Energy.

Nevertheless, doubt as to the existence of that beneficence has arisen in some minds from the fact that life mostly entails the endurance of so much pain and misery as to invalidate the grounds for that belief. I reply that life is universally regarded as a precious possession, and is enjoyed—in different degrees—by every individual in the entire animal creation; not one will part with its share without a struggle, if it has the power to defend itself. The universal sentiment of Humanity is—"Skin for (upon) skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life."

VIII

I shall next present, in a tabular form, the following statements derived from that knowledge of natural history which is common to all, reciting the chief sources of pleasure or happiness possessed by the animal creation.

1. Enjoyment of Food through the senses of taste and smell.	Enjoyed by the entire animal series, from the lowest conscious forms to the highest.
2. Acquirement of Power by growth, and the enlarged experience which it brings.	
3. The relations of love between the sexes.	
4. Social relations with others—Friendship.	Chiefly exemplified in Man, but embracing in a less degree some lower animals.
5. Appreciation of beauty—through the eye, of color, form—as presented in Man and especially in Woman. The charm of landscape, the cultivation of flowers (scents) and fruit; the garden. Impressions derived from grand scenery in all parts of the world—the pleasure of travel by land and sea.	
6. Delight from Musical Art, through the ear.	
7. The pleasure of Possession.	
8. The Practice of Art in all its branches.	
9. The Pursuit of Knowledge; acquisition of new facts—discovery in every department of life.	To Man only.
10. The pleasure derived from the exercise of Charity, from moral conduct, and in the exercise of the religious sentiment natural to Man, and already observed throughout all his history; becoming gradually developed and modified as he increases in his acquaintance with Nature, in the widest sense of the term, and in his power of reasoning from the facts thus acquired.	

By the long process of Man's evolution, ethical rules have been evolved. Men have learned that it was not only wise, but productive of satisfaction and often of pleasure, "To do unto others as you would they should do unto you"; that honesty was not only the best policy, but desirable for the reason just given. Thus it is that the "golden rule" has been enunciated in almost identical terms by the sages of other civilizations, even before the time of Christ. A code of morals has resulted by degrees as man himself has progressed, and is not the product of any supernatural revelation; a code which not only sets forth man's duties, but necessarily implies the existence of punitive consequences on any neglect of its articles. For due consideration

will render clear the fact that every breach of Nature's laws, whether physical or moral, certainly brings with it punishment in this life, sooner or later. For example, the man who merely consumes improper food or drink, or takes more than he can digest, pays the penalty which the error entails. Again, if he exerts his strength far beyond his powers, as in athletic contests, etc., he runs great risk of injuring his heart and of damaging his constitution as the result; one indeed too often met with. If he wastes his health and strength in debauchery, his punishment often speedily arrives, involving disease and shortened life, that possession which every sane man prizes above all other. So with every breach of moral law; any unjust act committed equally involves its penalty in this life. It brings long and bitter remorse in generous natures; in others, it surely tends to debase the individual; he becomes habituated to dishonorable designs and acts, and sinks lower in the scale of morality, until he loses self-respect, that of others, and at last is trusted by none. No doubt an unprincipled man may have a successful career, but his punishment surely arrives after a time. On the other hand, in every department of life unblemished character is the highest attainment; whatever of talent or of genius a man may display, he who has been proved by a past career to be a possessor of that, is the most valued and esteemed in any rank or condition of life, and is the most certain to secure success in the long run.

To the foregoing let me add a quotation here, and ask attention to it, in which these sentiments are tersely and beautifully expressed by an ancient Hebrew poet, whose religious creed, *let it be remembered, ignored any scheme of rewards and punishments in a future life*, Psalm xxxvii., vv. 35–37: "I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found. Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace."

I shall conclude this section by simply observing that the religion of Nature, the laws of which and their working have thus been briefly illustrated, and which is based upon the de-

termination not to believe anything which is not supported by indubitable evidence, must eventually become the faith of the future: its reception is a question for each man's personal convictions. It is one in which a priestly hierarchy has no place, nor are there any specified formularies of worship. For, "Religion ought to mean simply reverence and love for the Ethical ideal, and the desire to realize that ideal in life" (Huxley).[1]

IX

The facts of suffering and death which affect mankind—the former mostly, the latter universally—have been urged by many as incompatible with the attribution of goodness and benevolence to the Author of the Universe.

I shall first consider the last-named inevitable event, which each one of us must encounter. And I shall venture to state, as the known result of long and careful observation of the phenomena which then occur, that a really painful death from disease is never witnessed. Whatever of suffering may have previously occurred, which I shall deal with after this, the act of death is believed to be always preceded by a considerable period of insensibility. There may often be obvious automatic movements, not felt by the subject of them, but naturally distressing to bystanders, because resembling those of pain.

Acute and sometimes long-continued sufferings precede death, it may be for periods of considerable duration, sometimes for years. But thanks to man's scientific researches, especially to one of the most recent, the inhalation of anæsthetic vapors, all acute sufferings can be completely avoided. What untold and agonizing tortures would have been spared throughout his long history had this precious secret been revealed! *How evident it is that "Revelation" was no part of the plan.* In the

[1] Huxley's *Collected Works*, vol. v., p. 249. *Vide* also the following extract bearing on this subject: "There is a striking expression of Diderot's that all Revealed or National religions are only perversions of the Religion of Nature; and it is true, if the words Religion of Nature be taken in the highest sense."—Extracts from a letter by Jowett to Professor Caird, *Life of Jowett*, vol. i., p. 445.

course of most chronic diseases it is well known that some form of anodyne, of which several notable examples exist, can almost always be utilized so as to avoid severe suffering. No man should be a martyr to pain who can obtain a tolerably skilful medical attendant; and such are provided in all the public institutions for the care of the poor, or at the hospitals which abound in London, and exist in almost every small country town.

The sufferings of the lower animals are very far less than those of man. The sense of pain corresponds with the extent or the development of the nervous system; and this is extremely small among countless species of active living beings, *e.g.*, the insects—flying, creeping, or jumping—and furnishing a population far exceeding the sum total of the human inhabitants of the globe on any five acres of cultivated land, to say nothing of the inhabitants of the waters which wash our sea-coasts. Among insects may perhaps be partially excepted those which form social communities, as the ants, bees, wasps, etc., who have highly developed instincts, and concerning whose possession of some degree of consciousness it is impossible to speak with certainty. Shakespeare greatly erred when he said that the poor beetle we tread upon feels a pang as great as when a giant dies. Like ancient authors of all time, he could, when dealing with natural history, only reflect the knowledge of his age. His insight into human character, and his knowledge of the human heart, have never perhaps been surpassed by any, and his mastery in expressing thought has made him a poet for all time. Similar qualities existing, more or less, among some of the poets and prophets of the Hebrew race give their productions a high value in no way lessened by the fact that they were ignorant, when writing, of the earth and its origin, and of its relation to the rest of the universe.

It is impossible to state with certainty what amount of consciousness is present throughout the numerous species of animals which rank below the vertebrate series, but there is certainly ground for believing that they are incapable of suffering much pain, and that even the fierce carnivora inflict little or none in the act of killing their prey, although belonging

to the same order. For all are led by what is called instinct—probably inherited habit—to seize their victim at a vital spot, as by the neck, at the top of the spinal cord, which mostly destroys the power of movement and of sensation, of course in order to prevent struggles or acts of retaliation when possible.

Some of the higher vertebrata, especially those who have long held intimate associations with man, have had their intelligence and emotional powers much developed; for two obvious examples take the dog and the horse. Such are susceptible to pain and suffer much, and when inflicted, either by accident or design, should invariably be relieved, when possible, by the same anæsthetics employed for man.

There is another consideration supporting the view here taken of the beneficent tendency of the great but unknown Source of Infinite Energy, not to be overlooked. Granting this view to be correct, it is impossible not to believe that the influence of the Supreme Source must not merely equal, but greatly transcend any like or analogous quality—such as care, compassion, or kindness—which man can and does very largely exercise toward his fellows or dependents, all like himself having derived their being and its inherent qualities from that same Energy which pervades the universe.

X

Finally the cultivated and truly religious man finds his greatest happiness in the active and healthy exercise of all his functions—moral, intellectual, and physical. He is careful to promote the welfare of his fellow-creatures, not merely by works of charity but by enabling them to help themselves, and exercises his judgment to that end. Whatever he does it is his aim to attain the best result possible, and thus to make the most of the priceless boon of life. His religious feelings do not suggest to him the validity of the Christian practice of prayer to a Deity for gifts of any kind, even for the purpose of obtaining moral or mental improvement, nor for the recovery of the sick or protection from personal dangers, etc.—a practice which is so common—well knowing that all events must follow

the laws of nature, which are unalterable. No doubt the act of prayer, on the part of one who believes in its power to move the Deity to bestow a precious boon, brings consolation to the feelings of the applicant. It is a spiritual sedative which affords indescribable relief and enjoyment to many. Nevertheless, "Thy will, not mine be done," is the only prayer of the truly sensible Christian, and he may be grateful indeed that no other prayer can be acceptable. What a chaos would the world present if short-sighted men could interfere with the working of the laws which determine the course of events! For the religious man here described, adoration of the grandeur and of the beneficence which pervade the universe is the only sentiment suitable for public or for private religious service. "Lord, how manifold are thy works, in wisdom hast thou made them all" (Ps. civ., v. 24), expresses the same sentiment in the language of the Hebrew poet, in terms suitable to his day.

To conclude, he is grateful, yet proud to feel himself a participant in the great and endless procession of the wise and good throughout the ages; trustful, without shadow of a doubt respecting any kind of future there may be in store, and concerning which it is needless for him to inquire or speculate. He "lives a life of Faith" in the Source of the Infinite and Eternal Energy, confident in the knowledge that the laws of the Universe are the outcome of perfect Wisdom and Beneficence. The old Faiths, founded on so-called "revelation," have long been tested and are found wanting, and a natural religion will ultimately replace them. It is no part of this inquiry to dilate on what this comprehends. It is sufficiently defined in few and simple words at page 23 and note.

But it is not to be forgotten that a large proportion of the population in all Christian countries is ignorant of, or indifferent to, the subject of religious belief, unless the formal compliance with a certain slight ceremonial is considered to be religious worship. Concerning these it is not necessary to speak. On the other hand I have no desire to disturb the beliefs of those who derive comfort from the hope of a happy future in another world, and a motive for well-doing in this, which they derive from the Christian faith. It is especially undesirable to do so

in relation to the poor and uneducated, whose lot is mitigated thereby, and also to those who, possessing an ordinary share of intelligence, have confidently and happily rested on its hopes and promises for many past years.

I now close this essay, the materials for which in the shape of sundry notes I began to collect upward of twenty years ago. Others were frequently added, as I pondered much and often over what has long been a favorite theme, and it was not until a few years later that I copied into my note-book, on its first appearance in 1884, that striking passage from Herbert Spencer which is now quoted as a motto on the title-page. This indeed suggested the subject, respecting which, as it appeared to me, systematic research might be not only practicable, but might also be expected to yield some definite results.

I commenced my task solely for the purpose of seeking the truth for my own personal needs and enlightenment, incited thereto by the numerous and conflicting claims of the various sects, some diametrically opposed to each other, into which what is termed "Christianity" is divided. The original paper was written without any intention that it should be seen by any other eye than my own; nor has it been so seen until, having been considerably amplified, I submitted it to the judgment of a friend during the past year. For myself it has been a veritable "Pilgrim's Progress." The title, together with the form of the essay as it now stands, has been the result of the whole inquiry, and was not a predetermined intention.

I am now approaching the end, and find myself compelled to arrive at a conclusion, contrary, I gladly confess, to that which I at first entertained when engaged with the former part of the inquiry, and depressed by mentally realizing the miseries and hardships to which Man was exposed during the tardy development for unknown ages of what may be deemed the infancy and childhood of the race: a career which will probably continue many ages more before he approaches maturity.

But when that long inquiry came to an end, and not until then, the Truth—as I profoundly believe it to be—almost suddenly impressed me: to wit, that interference of a supernatural kind with man's doings (supposing its exercise to be pos-

sible within the limits of the great scheme of Nature) would have marred, if it did not arrest, the course of that development which has issued in the remarkable progress he has made, especially during the last three centuries.

I was now assured, by evidence which I could not resist, that all which man—with his limited knowledge and experience—has learned to regard as due to Supreme "Power" and "Wisdom," although immeasurably beyond his comprehension, is also associated with the exercise of an "Absolutely Beneficent" influence over all living things, of every grade, which exist within its range.

And the result of my labor has at least brought me its own reward, by conferring emancipation from the fetters of all the creeds, and unshakable confidence in the Power, the Wisdom, and the Beneficence which pervade and rule the Universe.

Finally, let me add that no one can feel more forcibly than myself that the foregoing pages offer only a very slight sketch of a most extensive and important subject. It is but a syllabus thereof, and in this sense I venture to offer it to the consideration of my readers. Moreover, I desire to state my belief that the subject of this paper, "The Unknown God"? may be regarded as in progress of solution by following the process suggested, and that "the Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed" will not ever remain wholly unknown or "unknowable," but may be still further elucidated as human faculties become highly developed in the progress of time, and rendered capable of receiving additional enlightenment respecting it.

XL

OUR GOAL

"THE MAKING OF A NATIONAL SPIRIT"

BY

EDWIN A. ALDERMAN

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

AND

"EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY"

BY

GEORGE HARRIS

PRESIDENT OF AMHERST COLLEGE

WHAT then is the meaning, what the purpose, we have discovered in modern life? We have sought to glance over the whole broad field of human thought and human endeavor, to summon at each turning of the road the voice of some master spirit to direct and inform our feebler knowledge. One would fain sum up the final result in a few simple words such as a child might understand. But, alas, no such simple answer to the problem has as yet become clear to all men. Here and there we find the enthusiast who believes he has solved all difficulties with a single potent word; but to most of us the meaning of life seems manifold, and its purpose, if that may indeed be expressed by a single term, must find expression in organ tones as yet too vast for human tongue.

Some effort, however, we can make toward understanding. Some effort we offer here in two remarkable speeches, delivered on notable occasions by two of our leading college presidents. At the last annual meeting of the New York Chamber of Commerce, its one hundred and thirty-seventh anniversary dinner, the speech of the evening by President Alderman, D.C.L., LL.D., of the University of Virginia, was upon the future of our American race, "the making of a national spirit." By Dr. Alderman's permission we print it here entire, except for one section in which

he turns aside to refer to his beloved South. The address must be read of course in the mood in which it was delivered to the eminent business leaders who sat listening; yet it manages to tell, with no uncertain note, high truths both brave and proud as to the progress and the spirit of our nation.

We present also the address made by President Harris, LL.D., of Amherst, on the occasion of his inauguration as head of his college. Some portions of this noteworthy speech were, of necessity, personal to the occasion; these we have, with Dr. Harris's consent, omitted. The main address was, however, general, an analysis of life and its needs to-day. Confronting the reader with this thoughtful, comprehensive view, we shall leave him to answer for himself, in accord with his own hopes, his wisdom, and his fortunes, "the meaning of modern life."

I APPRECIATE, as a teacher, the privilege of speaking to this ancient and powerful Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York at a moment when I do think it not assembled to discuss commerce alone, or to scan the balance of trade, but to discern the movement of the national spirit and to contribute to the health and strength of the national consciousness and character.

The speakers of the olden days proudly called you merchants, as they called my tribe schoolmasters and teachers. Now they call us—and a palatable brand of cracker—educators, and they call you names—largely—plutocrats and magnates, oligarchs, and other jagged-looking epithets. Other points of likeness between the schoolmaster and the merchant encourage me in the effort to make this speech, which I do not mean to be hortatory, for I agree with Charles Lamb that it is difficult to feel quite at ease with a schoolmaster, because he comes, like Gulliver, from among his young folks, and cannot easily adjust the stature of his understanding.

What we call business and stupidly think of as a coarse material machine is really the great cosmic university, to which nine-tenths of human beings go to learn truth-speaking —though they do not always learn it—and faith in men, and so prove themselves by suffering and service. What we call

trade is a great university-extension scheme for civilizing and keeping the peace among nations. The teacher inculcates ideals, and the merchant incarnates them for good or ill to this generation. An unfaithful merchant indicates social disease as surely as and more vividly than an immoral schoolmaster, for the master rules of both are fidelity, truth, and honor. The rewards and the power of both are great. The merchant's reward, if he be of intelligent mind, rich in social sympathy, far-seeing in conception, is above the valor of the soldier or the opportunity of the statesman in this modern world. The schoolmaster's reward sometimes comes too late to sweeten the toil of his day, and is of a kind not greatly molested by thieves or rust, or even the most absent-minded of moths. But it has some infinite satisfactions, and its power is simply symbolized by some cultivated, clean, and fearless youth ready for life and fit to illustrate the majesty of republican citizenship.

I, therefore, do not think of you this evening as great magnates, or as the "beaked and taloned graspers of the world," as some one has gently called you, but as my fellow-craftsmen, as plain, extraordinary men, whose proudest fortune is the legacy of American opportunity and citizenship, and whose proudest achievement will be to hand down that inheritance untarnished and undiminished.

It is fairly difficult these days to make a speech without mentioning Wall Street. I will begin pleasantly by saying that Wall Street is bracketed with Gehenna as a sort of symbol of sin in the minds of many good people. That is probably going too far. The reflection that its giant activities are grounded on faith and integrity and credit gives even to it and its fellow-sinners, Lombard and State Streets, a certain aspect of goodness, and, considering all things, increases my pride in the essential dignity of the race. Sometimes I go down there, impelled by that wonder which Plato called the beginning of knowledge. I seldom stay long, for the atmosphere leaves something to be desired in the way of academic peace, and enables a mere human to understand the psychology of the lamb. But I do not come away ever without stopping for a

look at the finest thing down there—the regnant figure of an old Virginia country gentleman, who was the richest man and the most public-spirited citizen of a simple age, standing upon the steps of the Sub-Treasury Building, looking out with honest, fearless eyes over that sea of hurrying men. That statue is the most remarkable allegory that ever got placed, by historic chance, at just the right spot in the history of the world, and points forward surely to the higher social order, when the Place Vendomes and Trafalgar Squares of the world will celebrate the glory of the great citizen. My speech is not going to wander far from that statue.

The conviction in the heart of George Washington that enabled him to be the richest man and the most public-spirited citizen of his time, this same conviction in the hearts of men in this Chamber, and everywhere in this nation, that enables them to be something of both, is the conviction with enough strength in it, if it be a conviction and not a spasmodic emotion, to carry this democratic experiment past a very serious peril. It is, therefore, pertinent to know what the conviction is, and to ask further if it can be reinfused in manly fashion into our republican life. Briefly put, it was the belief that a republic is the final form of human society, and the common individual man the sublimest asset of the world, that power rests on fitness to rule, that the sole object of power is the public good, and that service to the republic is a glory quite sufficient in itself.

To Washington these ideas had a religious sanction, for they were in the air of an age of moral imagination and superb human enthusiasm which counted the dual standard for private and for public life as the essence of republican treason. These ideas had the force of religious sanction, too, to Jay and Hamilton and Clinton, whose figures adorn your building down town, and one cannot look into St. Gaudens's face of Lincoln in Chicago, with its commonness and plainness, and yet with its sublimity and gentleness, without seeing those ideas shining there, revealing the real glory of that great common man, and teaching through that melancholy world-face the whole splendid rise of man to soul and mind and will. That

noble and pathetic scene at Newburg, when Washington put aside all ambition, was not hard for him, and he probably did not realize what a type of self-effacement Newburg would become because of it. A century of trial has somewhat dulled the halo about democracy to fools and those of little faith, though the great optimism has abated sectarian fury, abolished legal slavery, protected and enlarged manhood suffrage, mitigated much social injustice, increased kindness and gentleness, preserved the form of the Union, conquered its wildernesses, developed great agencies of culture, and made it a symbol of prosperity.

But it has also developed new and hateful masters in politics and new shapes of temptation and wrong-doing, and after a generation of amazing constructive effort, without sufficient leisure for ethical considerations, it is in danger of its own strength, and it must protect itself with its own strength. I am not railing against great constructive forces, or uttering cheap prophecies of damnation, or doubting that the future will be an industrial world, which means a republican world. I am simply claiming that democracy, like a man's character, is never out of danger. It is not selfishness or corruption alone which we have to fear, for we have vanquished these before, but as much the temper of despair and faithlessness which blinds the eyes of the youth to the heroic simplicity and love of freedom at the heart of the American people. And my concern is for youth, for the grown folks are generally past saving. The chief weapon of the protective strength of democracy I conceive to be the acceptance of the Washington type of public spirit as a working form of patriotism upon as large a scale in the social and political order as the instinct for co-operation and combination has been accepted in the industrial world. By the measure in which United States Steel surpasses the blacksmith's shop in efficiency, by the measure in which municipal government surpasses the rural township in complexity of politics—in that measure must both politics and business cease to be regarded as a game or as war, or as a fixed code, or as a treasure-trove, and come

to be thought of as a public function, as a public trust, not only in method and organization, but in moral responsibility. Does this involve a moral miracle, or an utter change in human nature, or a surrender of democracy to state socialism or some other order? It certainly involves the reaffirmation of the founder's idea of public spirit as a dominant national motive and as a sort of inner well-spring of conduct, in place of the idea of headlong strength and achievement and speed, following, as a sort of spiritual corrective, the gigantic system of modern business, and the new brood of political conditions with which neither statute law nor public morals have been able to keep pace. In short, as an industrial democracy has carried to high efficiency a new philosophy of business and politics, so it must reaffirm and reincarnate its old philosophy of citizenship and patriotism.

Patriotism, therefore, which is hard to define and new with every age, must redefine itself. It meant manhood rights when Washington took it to his heart, as it means to the Russian to-day. It meant culture and refinement and mental distinction when Emerson, in his Phi Beta Kappa address, "besought the sluggish intellect of his country to look up from under its iron lids." It signified ideals and theories of government to the soldiers of Grant and Lee. It meant industrial greatness and splendid desires to annex nature to man's uses when the great leaders of the generation, whose statesmanship and imagination no man will deny, built up their business and tied the Union together in a unity of steel and steam.

To-day it means a vast reaction from an unsocial and predatory individualism to self-restraint and consideration for the general welfare, expressing itself in a cry for fairness and honor and sympathy in use of power and wealth, as the states of spirit and mind that alone can safeguard republican ideals.

If in our youth and breathlessness there has grown up a spreading insanity of desire for quick wealth and a theory of life in lesser minds that esteems money as everything, and therefore is willing to do everything for money, that very fact has served to define the patriotic duty and mood of the public

mind. And is not the theory of our overlooking special Providence borne out in the fact that, as in the period seeking to establish manhood rights there stood forth at the head of the government the figure of Washington, a republican saint around whom a young nation should rally, so now in a period pausing to search its heart, after a certain madness of spirit, there stands forth the figure of a bold prophet of common righteousness and common service and common decency strong enough to be everywhere, and sincere enough and unconscious enough to preach his doctrine in a thousand voices? This reawakened patriotism of the common good has the advantage of appeal to a young public conscience not yet unbalanced by hysteria, and of being supported by a valid and unauthoritative public opinion, not yet dulled by contentment. Sound public conscience and valid public opinion are the last unbreached strongholds of our old democracy. In proof of their soundness and authority I claim that if there be a man in America to-day who has an unjust fortune, and a pagan ideal of its use, he will not bask as cosily in the respect of his fellows, nor have as much fun, as Crœsus or Louis XIV. The gift of one hundred and seven millions of dollars in one year by private individuals to the general welfare, a colossal development of the sense of social obligation barely dreamed of by Washington, is the testimony on the affirmative side of this opinion. A servant of the people, in city or state, who is afield for exploitation rather than service is not as highly honored a man as was Robert Walpole, or Warren Hastings, or Aaron Burr, as the roll-call of some prison houses will show. The disposition which democracy has just shown, at the most inconvenient moment, to ask the powers that be whether they are the powers that ought to be, in Mr. Lowell's phrase, and the answer to the question, are the testimonies on the affirmative side of that opinion. Plain people, it is true, are not as awestruck at the names of the powerful as they once were, but one may note a growing ability to render awe where awe is due, which is a beautiful growth in discernment. In a nobler, truer light shine for the people of America the names of those upright souls, in business and

politics, in this Chamber and out of it, who have held true in a heady time, who have kept quick and human their popular sympathies and their republican ideals, and, by so doing, have kept sweet their country's fame.

What is the influence of the schools and the universities, the public conscience and public opinion, in this ever new remoulding of the national spirit? These schools and universities have been changing their form from simplicity to power under the pressure of this same era of passionate strength, and educational ideals are more often the result of social pressure than social ideals are the result of educational direction. What are the results? I claim this much for the schools: they are to-day more helpfully related to the public life of states and cities than ever before. They are closer to the needs of that body who are neither rich nor poor, and upon whom rests the solution of our problems. They are producing more abundantly and scattering more widely the results of their production. They speak with the authority of knowledge. The same protest of our time has therefore come out of them. The scholarship in them, neither radical nor subservient, is thoroughly permeated with a sense of public spirit and informed with a note of hopefulness and seriousness and old-fashioned belief in the mission of the republic. To be sure, this scholarship is not mere goodness, for untrained goodness does not count for much in this world, whatever may be its felicities in the next; but it is scholarship that cannot be frightened, because it is capable, and cannot be corrupted, because it is fortified with faith and ideals; and it is unweakened by cynicism or despair, because it is made possible by the beneficence of the individual and the capacity of states. Therefore, I reckon, as Mr. Bryce did, that the most helpful aspect of the republic is the spectacle of the schools and colleges struggling to fashion the right sort of an American, tempting the rich to service, conveying to states the idea of civic duty, preserving the great popular heart from envy and hatred, and establishing a standard where men may repair and make a stand for the eternal values.

"EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY"

BY

GEORGE HARRIS

The objects and methods of education engage the attention of thinking people at the present time as never before. This great interest was left, until lately, to professional educators, while the people were comparatively indifferent, but now it is a theme of discussion in magazines and newspapers, on the platform and in conversation. All the way through, from kindergarten to professional school, the aims of education are undergoing severe scrutiny. The college does not escape, but is required to give an account of itself in justification of its achievements and in ready adaptation to the instruction of all who are entitled to the advantages of liberal culture. The decisive question is the question of fitness, which the college as truly as the grammar school must answer. Fitness for what? Education is a means to an end. What end? Since, directly or indirectly, the people are taxed for the support of the college, since the college is a public institution, a liberal education should prepare men for service in society, for citizenship in the free state. The subject, therefore, to which, without further preface, I invite your attention is "The Man of Letters in a Democracy." The function of cultivated men in the modern state determines the aims and methods of their education. Every question of the college concerning choice of studies, modes of instruction, physical culture, and religious life must be answered in view of the function of the man of letters in a democracy. He is not always successful in finding his place, nor, indeed, in finding any place among the people. Yet no man is capable of rendering greater ser-

vice, and therefore of sustaining greater obligation to the state, than the man of letters.

A few axioms, briefly stated, define democracy. It is more than a form of government, since it exists under various forms of government. The function of the citizen involves more than voting and holding office, although these duties are important. Every value of life is included in the state, or, better, all values are co-ordinated in the state. For democracy maintains and assures two things, freedom and justice. To every man his right—that is justice. It also is freedom. Every man, therefore, must defend the right of every other man, must see to it that his own objects do not conflict with the righteous and rightful objects of others, for thus only can all have freedom with justice. The right of every man is this: that he should make the most and best of himself, that he should possess and enjoy all the values he is able to possess and enjoy. Hence the material, intellectual, domestic, æsthetic, moral, and religious values are included and are protected in democracy which insures justice and freedom to all and to each. The attainment of one man is more largely in this direction, of another in that, but the state guarantees the right of every man in that freedom which regards the right of others to possess and enjoy all the legitimate values of life. Democracy is the true individualism, for it regards every person as an end, never as a means or a tool. It makes for the well-being of each, and therefore guards every institution, the family, the school, the church,—protects every pursuit that creates values, from the material to the spiritual; in a word, is itself the institute of justice and so of the freedom that is grounded in justice. Democracy is the true socialism, which is not paternalism, but is self-government by which free individuals so regulate society—that is, regulate themselves—that each may have the utmost freedom that is compatible with the freedom of other individuals in attaining the values of personal and social life. These axioms, put concretely, mean bread winning and bread eating, that is, just economic conditions. They mean home and friendship, they mean science and art, they mean free religion, they mean the things the state does as a state—laws,

rules, courts, tariffs, taxes, expansion or limitation of territory. In all these things, democracy protects and even helps every man in coming to his own.

This is no other than the religious conception of society, or at least is largely included in the religious conception. It is not too much nor too little to say that Jesus came preaching and founding democracy—the true individualism and the true socialism—in which every human institution, interest, and ideal has its rightful place. He called it the kingdom of God, which is God's purpose for humanity seen in the moral order of history as it has evolved, seen in the Christian ideal of personal worth and mutual service, seen in the kingdom of God on earth in which we are brothers one of another. Define the true democracy, then define the kingdom of God on earth; and you will find you have simply given two titles to the same thing. Find me the man who is making the most and the best of himself in such ways that others may do the same and you have found me the modern saint.

I need not say that democracy has not yet in any state fully secured its object, but the social ideal of democracy is the divine order of humanity, and it is the duty of every one to promote that ideal; by criticism, by reform, by eternal vigilance; by intelligent voting, by active influence, by fraternity; above all and through all, by acting his own part as the righteous citizen in the free state, making the most and the best of himself, making his pursuit contribute to the common weal and thus converting the actual into the ideal republic. Surely modern democracy, if this view of it is correct, is roomy enough even for the man of letters—especially for the man of letters.

Three attitudes, now, may be taken toward the democracy in which we have our habitation. One attitude is withdrawal. One may insulate one's self from vital concern in the actual life of the people. Having an assured income provided by others, a man may devote himself to pleasure, to travel, to literary culture, putting himself practically out of relation to the world of human struggle and attainment. Religiously this was the monastic life of the Middle Ages—out in the wilder-

ness, out of the world. The gentleman of leisure leading a luxurious life is the secular monk. The literary dilettante is the intellectual or æsthetic monk. The pietist who would save his soul by not doing certain things is the modern religious monk.

The second attitude is the parasitic, or, even more strongly, the piratical. One may go into the democracy for what one can get out of it for one's self, looking on the existing order as an arrangement out of which something can be had for one's own comfort or pleasure. Such a one would exploit democracy for his own benefit and pay as light a tax as possible. The generations and contemporaries have established a society holding certain values, and the exploiter, like a thief in the night, breaks through and steals. The State saves him the trouble of maintaining a band of armed retainers. Laws and courts are good, for they protect him in his thieving. The army is at his back that he may till his vineyard and run his mill. The one maxim of the pirate in a democracy is, "My rights, your duties."

The third attitude is the reciprocal. A man looks out on democracy and contributes to it, putting in as much as he takes out, or more, paying his full tax, making his pursuit part of a whole which is for good. He is a Christian citizen of the modern world. His maxim for at least half of his life is, "Your rights, my duties."

The man of letters, by whom I mean the man that is liberally educated, the cultivated man, for practical purposes the college man—although there are men of letters that never saw a college and college men that are uneducated—the man of letters is expected to take this last attitude of contributing his part in promoting the ends of democracy, putting in as much as he takes out. He has been loudly accused of taking the first attitude, of insulating himself from public affairs, or at best of holding aloof as an impractical critic of the order of things, of standing on the shore declaring with many gesticulations how the ship of state should be sailed, but never handling a tiller or pulling a rope. There has been enough of this to bring reproach on academic discussion of affairs. By aca-

demic discussion of politics, for example, is meant theoretical, impractical, doctrinaire. But there is an important and indispensable part for the man of talent and education to play. I do not say that his part is more essential than that of the average working man, for all parts are necessary in the social organism. The eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of thee." But also the hand cannot say to the eye, "I have no need of thee." The state needs citizens of intellectual ability, of character, and of high standards, for leaders, rulers, and teachers, and has a right to look to the college for them. The college is an integral part of the system of education maintained by the state, and therefore the state has claims upon college-bred men. It is of little consequence whether colleges are established directly by the state or are privately endowed. In the latter case, the state grants immunities and exemptions and refrains from maintaining colleges and universities of its own. By cherishing higher educational interests, the state signifies its need of cultivated men in the professions, in business, in legislation. By a process of selection, young men of promise and ambition continue their education for several years that they may render service of a higher order than manual labor—the service of leadership, which is as much needed as manual labor, without which manual labor is inefficient. That is to say, the state expends on a selected class a thorough training that they may be fitted for highest service to the state, whether they hold political office or not. And this class is the real aristocracy.

We have outgrown the crude notion that democracy is equality and that it has no use for an aristocracy. Some belated doctrinaires are still proposing schemes for equalizing the condition of men, and so for equalizing men. But it is not the problem of democracy to raise all men up nor to draw all men down to a common level. Its problem is to place its best men in its highest places, to put power in the hands of the wisest and most capable persons, to recognize superiority, always to put the right man in the right place. For the aristocracy of birth it has no great regard, although it does not forget that blood tells. For the vulgar aristocracy of wealth it has supreme

contempt. To the accident of rank and title it is indifferent. But it recognizes the aristocracy of merit, knowledge, character. Democracy would replace the aristocracy of birth by the aristocracy of worth; would set aside the aristocracy that buys place with gold for that which earns place by capability and distinguished service. Democracy needs nothing so much as it needs such an aristocracy. Otherwise it is a mob, a crowd, a horde, a mass of unorganized and disorganized units. The very word "aristocracy" means the rule of the best, the best men in power. If the best men have guidance and control, progress is constantly made. If they are set aside in favor of the incompetent, there is confusion and every evil work. There are enough capable men in the United States to fill all positions of trust and honor, to be a political, economic, intellectual aristocracy. Put them in their rightful places, let the aristocracy of merit be enthroned as well as acknowledged, and there will be that government, that national welfare, that prosperity which constitute social well-being and insure progress. So the state does not regard all citizens as equal and draw rulers and leaders by lot, but wants true, wise, able, educated men for guidance, organization, and service. Therefore in a democracy there must be higher education for the few who are fit by nature and may become fitter by training for leadership. Professor Paulsen, tracing the educational ideal of the future, says that "The society corresponding to that ideal would be that of an aristocracy of mind," and asks, "is this the type toward which we are leaning? Is the aristocracy of birth and wealth to be supplanted by the aristocracy of personal worth and merit?" "This," he says, "has been the philosopher's dream from the day of Plato's republic to the present hour. It is the tendency of nature. It would be the aristocracy of nature to have every individual stand independently upon his own personal merit, and not upon the achievements of his father, while the influence of heredity, in the sense of the transmission of personal characteristics, would not be diminished. This is the aristocracy to which historical development seems to point. Both church and state have made considerable advancement toward the realization of this

ideal of a personal *élite*, by bestowing position and influence according to the degree of personal talent and efficiency without regard to birth and position."

Education makes this ideal definite. The educated man is aware of the personal and social ideal of democracy, and can direct his energies intelligently toward its realization in the sphere of his own action. The movements of our time affect many who do not understand them. Not until changes have occurred do the uneducated discern them. Anybody can compare the close with the middle of the century and perceive advance in means of locomotion and communication—even in education, politics, and religion. Many who do not understand the significance of great movements are borne along by them to their own material, intellectual, and moral advantage. But educated men perceive tendencies in the making and foresee results not yet attained. To be sure, no one can read the future as one reads the past, for God's purposes in humanity are partly disclosed, partly concealed. Yet there is a direction of the path of progress out of the present into the future, a direction tolerably plain to one who knows the past and knows men. All liberal studies are for the one purpose of showing the ideal—the personal and social ideal—not only that it may be perceived but that there may be direction toward it in new and changing conditions.

XXI—LIFE'S INTERCOURSE

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT WHEELER

1. To what extent did Alexander's conquests fasten the Greek language upon the ancient world?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 141.

2. How far did the Roman tongue aid in Romanizing Europe?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., pp. 265 and 362.

3. How did the Greek tongue come to reassert itself as the official speech of the Roman Empire?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 320.

4. How deep was Rome's impress upon Great Britain, as measured by language?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 285; Vol. IV., p. 182.

5. What record does the English language preserve of the chief historical modifications of the race?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 204.

6. Of what value did the Greeks' ancient language prove to them in their war for freedom?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., pp. 1, 65, and 112.

7. Through what agencies had this language been mainly altered?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 147; Vol. VIII., p. 55.

8. What national influences moulded the French language?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 334; Vol. V., p. 276.

9. When did it almost achieve supremacy as a world language?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. xiii.

10. What prevented its dominance?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 347.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "LIFE'S INTERCOURSE," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXI Page	
2.	The story of Navarino and its effect is fully told by Harriet Martineau in her *History of England*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 135.
3.	The struggle and survival of the Eastern or Greek Catholic Church are narrated by H. F. Tozer in *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, or *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 189.
3.	The late Greek-Turkish war is described by Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett in his *Battlefields of Thessaly*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 208.
4.	For the importance which Rome and its language still hold in modern civilization see the *Law Code* of Justinian, or *Great Events*, Vol. IV., p. 138.
5.	The thoughts and language of Buddhism, with quoted examples, are given in *Buddhism*, by J. W. Rhys-Davids, or *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 160.
5.	For the growth of the German language under the influence of the Reformation see J. Koestlin's *Life of Luther*, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 1.
6.	The difficulties confronting Austria-Hungary, with its two languages, are shown by C. A. Fyffe in his *History of Modern Europe*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., p. 163.
8.	The attitude and feelings of the literature of ancient Greece are well illustrated in Plato's *Phædo*. See *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 87.

XXII—THE BOY

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT GILMAN

1. What ideas as to the teaching of youth were held in the ancient world?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 34.

2. What was the Spartan system of training?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 181 et seq.

3. What the Athenian? And what contrasting results were achieved by each of these?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 235 et seq.; Vol. II., p. 12.

4. Are there any early historic instances of the value of home influence?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 259.

5. To what extent did the father hold authority over the son under Roman law?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 148.

6. When and under what conditions was a Roman youth judged old enough to assume his own guardianship?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 157.

7. When and under whom were schools first organized in modern civilization?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., pp. 366 and 368.

8. What were the first efforts at education among the English people?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 78.

9. Into what hands was the training of youth committed in mediæval days?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 192.

10. What was the condition of education in Elizabethan England?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. X., p. 8.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE BOY," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXII Page.

5. The earliest efforts to educate youths as individuals are discussed in *Comenius: His Life and Educational Works*, by S. S. Lawrie, or *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 192.

6. The development of Franklin from boyhood, and his remarkable career, are detailed in *Complete Works of Benjamin Franklin*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 130.

7. The attempt of Pestalozzi to train children by sympathy, practically the beginning of modern education, is described in *Pestalozzi's Method of Education*, by George Ripley, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 364.

8. The arrested development of the Emperor Charles V., and his slow advance to the maturity of his power, are described in *History of the Reign of Charles V.*, by W. Robertson, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 348.

8. The story of Sir Richard Church and the aid extended by him to the Greeks in their war of independence is narrated in *Greece in the Nineteenth Century*, by Lewis Sergeant, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 65.

13. The words and teachings of St. Paul are enlarged on in *Origin of Christianity*, by I. M. Wise, or *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 88.

16. Something of the wonders achieved by modern astronomy is suggested in *Pioneers of Science*, by Sir Oliver Lodge, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVII., p. 25.

XXIII—HOW TO THINK

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY DR. HALE

1. How do the underlying principles of Asiatic or Eastern thought differ from those of the West?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. XXVII.

2. What effect has this difference had in deciding the history of East and West?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 161.

3. What is the spirit of fatalism which underlies Mahometan thought?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 237 et seq.

4. What effect has this had on the career of the Mahometan races?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 247.

5. What were the teachings of St. Paul as to the freedom of thought and will?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 74 et seq.

6. What has been the usual attitude of the Christian Church upon this doctrine?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 300 et seq.

7. Has memory played any appreciable part in the development of art?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 110.

8. Of music?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 32 et seq.

9. Into what terrible tragedy did uncontrolled imagination lead the early Puritans?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XII., p. 268.

10. In what well-known warfare did a vigorous use of the imagination lead to success?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVII., p. 334.

XXIII

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "HOW TO THINK," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXIII PAGE

1. The days of Dr. Samuel Johnson and his friends are well described by Justin McCarthy, in his *History of the Four Georges*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 117.

3. The teachings of the Apostle Paul are pointed out by I. M. Wise in his *Origin of Christianity*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 69.

4. The thoughts of Mr. Ruskin as to art and its origin are exemplified in his *Stones of Venice*. See *Great Events*, Vol. IV., p. 95.

5. The power of man to control and guide his will was preached in England as early as the days of the Venerable Bede; see his *Ecclesiastical History of Britain*, or *Great Events*, Vol. IV., p. 182.

6. That man may train his memory long after he has lost the plasticity of childhood is shown in the story of *Alfred the Great*, by Thomas Hughes. See *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 49.

7. For the tragic fate of Louis XVI. and his unhappy son consult Guizot's *Popular History of France*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 311.

XXIV—THE GIRL

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY MR. REID

1. What was the state of "society" in New England in colonial days?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XII., p. 125.

2. What in the Southern States?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 81.

3. In what way were the "seriousness and faith" of our ancestors proven?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 303; Vol. XII., p. 153.

4. Into what great tragedy did the delusion of "equality" lead mankind?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIV., p. 295.

5. To what dangerous political extremes have the United States been already led?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XV., p. 20 et seq.

6. Where, before our own days, did the desire for amusement rise to even higher extravagance?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 301; Vol. III., p. 265.

7. Was it the dominant purpose of the French noblesse in the eighteenth century?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. XIII.

8. How have the United States disturbed the law of nations by over-sympathy with Ireland?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., p. 325.

9. How has Ireland deserved that sympathy?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVII., p. 84.

10. What were the chief dangers of the reconstruction period in the United States?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. XVIII.

XXIV

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE GIRL," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXIV Page

2. The number and influence of the lawyers engaged in forming the American Union are shown by Andrew Young in his *American Statesman*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 173.

3. The "excesses of Democracy" are illustrated by James Parton in his *Life of Andrew Jackson*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 143.

5. The change of type which has come over the American nation may be seen by reading C. W. Elliott's *The New England History*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XII., p. 241.

8. The steadiness in a political policy displayed by the American colonists is described by James Grahame in his *History of the Rise and Progress of the United States*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 289.

8. The readiness for change inherent in French politics is shown by Lamartine in his *History of the Restoration of Monarchy in France*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 207.

8. The prominence of various other factions in American politics at the time of the formation of the Republican party is pointed out by Lincoln in the *Lincoln and Douglas Debates*. See *Great Events*, Vol. XVII., p. 256.

9. The tale of the late Spanish-American war is told by H. H. Bancroft in *The New Pacific*, and by A. S. Draper in *The Rescue of Cuba*. See *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., pp. 227 and 235.

11. A full account of the various efforts to build a Panama canal is given by A. M. Law in a monograph on the subject. See also the speech of Senator Depew, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 360.

XXV—MANHOOD

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT ANDREWS

1. What limitations were imposed upon the selection of one's life-work among the ancient Egyptians?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. xxv.

2. How, in mediæval days, did the Feudal system affect the free choice of a career?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 4.

3. What preparations were then required for entering the ministry?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 231; Vol. IX., p. 27.

4. What training had the early Protestant ministers?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p.176.

5. Under what denomination did preaching become almost wholly dissociated from preliminary training?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 57.

6. What was the status of the legal profession in Roman times?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 140.

7. Why and when were the Americans called "a nation of lawyers"?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. xxv.

8. What was the position of the medical profession in mediæval days?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 51 et seq.

9. When did "business" or trade become the chief means of accumulating wealth?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., p. xvi.

10. What warlike qualities were then demanded of the man of commerce?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., p. 214.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "MANHOOD," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXV Page	
2.	For the fitness of Robert E. Lee for the profession of arms see Rossiter Johnson's *History of the War of Secession*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., p. 53.
2.	The most celebrated example of a man pursuing a single overmastering ambition from childhood is that of Alexander the Great. See Creasy's *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, or *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 141.
3.	The life of Bach shows us a musician similarly secure of his intent. See H. Tipper's *The Growth and Influence of Music*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 31.
3.	Cæsar is often quoted as one whose early career of debauchery gave no indication of his later power, as is shown by Napoleon III. in his *History of Julius Cæsar*, or *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 267.
4.	For a man wholly misunderstanding his own abilities and finding his mission by accident, we have Clive. See *Lord Clive*, by Sir A. J. Arbuthnot, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 185.
5.	As an example of a man driven by inward compulsion to a life wholly different from his original plans, see *Loyola and Jesuitism*, by Isaac Taylor, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 261.
11.	A teacher following his instinctive bent from childhood is shown in Ripley's monograph on *Pestalozzi*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 364.

XXVI—THE COLLEGE GRADUATE

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT THWING

1. What nation formed the great business people of antiquity?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 179.

2. How did the wild Teutons who overthrew the Roman world learn to be men of business?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 364 et seq.

3. What was the social position of the merchant in mediæval days, and to what extent was he apt to be a man of culture?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 6.

4. Where and how did modern business men first rise to control the government of their state?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., p. XVI.

5. In what sense were the maritime discoveries of the fifteenth century economic victories?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 266; Vol. VIII., p. 299.

6. When and how did the frenzy of speculation sweep the aristocracy into "business"?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., pp. 1 and 22.

7. Has any age before our own felt the difficulties of over-education?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIV., p. XIII.

8. To what extent did "tradesmen" control the American Revolution?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 289.

9. What was the first great economic victory of the past century on land?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., p. 94.

10. What victories have been achieved over the ocean?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XV., p. 159; Vol. XVIII., p. 175.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE COLLEGE GRADUATE," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXVI Page

2. The first invention and employment of the steam locomotive are described by Samuel Smiles in his *Life of George Stephenson*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 157.

2. The greatest of American railroad achievements is detailed by J. P. Davis in *The Union Pacific Railway*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., p. 287.

2. For the first establishment of banking institutions in America consult Hamilton and Lewis' *History of the Bank of North America*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 230.

3. The beginnings of modern education are to be found detailed in S. S. Laurie's *Comenius*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 192.

4. For the early successes of engineering before it was an established profession see Andrew D. White's *Richelieu*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 129.

6. The first awakening of Englishmen to the value of secular education is described by J. R. Green in his *History of the English People*, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 137.

9. The beginning of an intellectual study of the fine arts appears with the Renaissance. See *The Medici and the Italian Renaissance*, by W. Smeaton, or *Great Events*, Vol. VIII., p. 134.

11. The nature of the power and triumphs of Gladstone is outlined by Justin McCarthy in his *Epoch of Reform*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVII., p. 11.

XXVII—SPORT

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT CLEVELAND

1. When were hunting and fishing still the business of the majority of men, instead of being merely sport?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. xxi.

2. What were the chief sports encouraged among the Greeks?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 199.

3. How were these given religious sanction?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 181.

4. What effect did these physical exercises of the Greeks have upon the history of the world?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 185.

5. What were the sports of ancient Rome?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 273.

6. To what extent were sports approved by the early Christian Church?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 329.

7. How did William the Conqueror arrange ground for hunting in the early days of England?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 245.

8. What was the chief sport of the yeomen of England, and of what value did it prove?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., pp. 78 and 320.

9. When did the Church in England place itself in flat opposition to sport, and what was the result upon the English nation?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 378.

10. What effect did existence on the edge of a wilderness have upon the love of "sport" in colonial America?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XII., p. 125.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "SPORT," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture	Page	
XXVII		1. The aptitude of our Southern ancestors in sport of every kind is shown in W. Sargent's *History of an Expedition against Fort Du Quesne*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 163.
		1. The earliest modern recognition of the beauty and joy of outdoor life is described by J. Burckhardt in his *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, or *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 93.
		3. For evidence that the early kings of England were eager sportsmen it is only necessary to consult the old *Domesday Book*, or *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 242.
		3. The extravagant excesses to which devotion to sport may lead is illustrated by the career of Commodus, as narrated in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, or *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 263.
		4. The relative prowess shown in our Civil War by the Northern soldiers as opposed to the Southrons, with their open-air life, is pointed out by Horace Greeley in *The American Conflict*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., p. 26.
		5. Striking evidence of the advantage of physical activity and alertness was furnished by the success of the Japanese in their recent war. See the monograph on *The Russo-Japanese War*, by Charles F. Horne, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIX, p. 381.

XXVIII—THE TOILERS

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT WRIGHT

1. What was the position of labor in the Middle Ages?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., pp. XIII and XVI; Vol. VIII., p. XIII.

2. What early, unsuccessful revolts did the laboring classes attempt, and with what result?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. XXIII; Vol. VII., p. 164; Vol. IX., p. 93.

3. Where and when did the great labor "guilds" rise to control nations?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., pp. 23 and 68.

4. When and how did the participation of the lower classes in government begin in England?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., p. 246.

5. In France?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 17.

6. Was the French Revolution an uprising of the laboring classes?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIV., pp. XVIII and 212.

7. When and how did democracy, the power of the masses, become supreme in America?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XV., p. XX et seq.

8. When and through what strife did the common people secure some share of power in Europe?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., p. XIII et seq.

9. To what extremes has the labor movement been driven in Germany?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 115 et seq.

10. Under what new guise has the labor question appeared in connection with the Panama Canal?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 360.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE TOILERS," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXVIII Page

1. The condition of the laboring masses in England in the eighteenth century is depicted by W. Lecky in his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XIII., p. 57.

2. The position of the slaves in the Southern States is shown by J. K. Ingram in his *History of Slavery and Serfdom,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XVI., p. 296.

3. The early efforts of the masses for recognition in the United States Government are pointed out by H. von Holst in his *Constitutional and Political History of the United States,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XV., p. 18.

3. The final success of the uneducated populace in securing control of the American national government is described by James Parton in his *Life of Andrew Jackson,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XVI., p. 143.

6. The struggles of the English lower classes for an adequate share of government are narrated in the *Constitutional History of England,* by Sir Thomas May, or *Great Events,* Vol. XVI., p. 252.

12. The gradual rise of Socialism is detailed by Thomas Kirkup in his *History of Socialism,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XVIII., p. 141.

13. The position of the serfs of Russia is described in a monograph by Andrew D. White, and in one by Turgenieff. See *Great Events,* Vol. XVII., p. 353.

XXIX—THE SOIL

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY MR. WALLACE

1. When in ancient history was there an agricultural war?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 109.

2. How did the land of Europe come into possession of the ancestors of the present owners?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 22.

3. Under what system was it distributed and how paid for?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 1.

4. What was the earliest armed rebellion in mediæval times against the usurpers of the soil?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 164.

5. What is the story of More's martyrdom?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., pp. 137 and 206.

6. What were the effects of Rousseau's preachings of reform?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 153.

7. How was the American Revolution associated with the French declaration of the Rights of Man?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. xxiv.

8. How has the "rapid growth of steam power" influenced the civilization of our own land?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. 287.

9. What was the first of the series of reform bills which have marked England's legislation in the past century?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., p. 175.

10. What was the most important of these bills?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVI., p. 252.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE SOIL," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXIX Page	
2.	The earliest modern attempt at overturning the established order of society is described by Johann Neander in his *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, or *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 340.
2.	The story of Wat Tyler's rebellion is told in Lingard's *History of England*, or *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 217.
5.	The confusion of all political theories consequent upon the Napoleonic wars is pointed out by William Hazlitt in his *Life of Napoleon*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 76.
7.	The remarkable results from the nineteenth-century development of photography are detailed by W. J. Harrison in his *History of Photography*. See *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 338.
7.	For the manner in which the hopes of the common people were betrayed after the overthrow of Napoleon see Charles Maurice's *Revolutionary Movements of 1848–1849*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 1.
10.	The blind persistence of kingly faith in the doctrine of "divine right" is well shown in Knight's *Popular History of England*, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 311.
18.	The story of the plundering of the abbeys by Henry VIII. is fully told by J. R. Green in his *History of the English People*, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 203.
18.	The Catholic view of this and similar transactions is given by Jean Audin in his *Life of Luther*, or *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 26.

XXX—ANARCHISM

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY COUNT TOLSTOI

1. What is Nihilism?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 71.

2. When in European history has anarchy held open sway?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 93.

3. What has been the most recent and tragic example of anarchy in full control of a great city?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. 351.

4. Has anarchy ever sprung from the highest instead of the lowest strata of society?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 259; Vol. III., p.108.

5. What conquerors have been most anarchistic in their subversion of order?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., pp. 1 and 72.

6. What was perhaps the hugest of slaughters caused solely by the selfish ambition of kings?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 169.

7. Where is anarchism most prevalent to-day?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. xvi.

8. What approach to anarchy has appeared in Germany?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 115.

9. How was this met by Bismarck?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 116.

10. When was Nihilism in Russia once upon the eve of armed revolt?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 83 et seq.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "ANARCHISM," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture	Page	
XXX		
	1.	The trial and execution of Louis XVI. are powerfully described in Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution.* See *Great Events,* Vol. XIV., p. 295.
	1.	The story of Maximilian's struggle in Mexico and of his death is told by his Aide, Prince Salm-Salm, in *My Diary in Mexico in 1867.* See *Great Events,* Vol. XVIII., p. 186.
	2.	The eventful career of Henry IV. of France is recorded in the *Memoirs* of his trusted comrade, the Duc de Sully, extracts from which are in *Great Events,* Vol. X., p. 276.
	3.	The tragedy of Russian slaughter at Plevna is told by William Mueller in his *Political History of Recent Times,* or in *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 1.
	3.	The unfortunate results of Italy's colonization attempts in Abyssinia are described in a special monologue by Frederick A. Edwards. See *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 194.
	5.	The invasion of China consequent upon the Boxer tumults is described by W. A. Martin in his *Siege of Pekin,* or in *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 333.
	9.	The causes which led to the restoration of Charles II. and the feeling of the English people toward Cromwell are portrayed in the *Diary* of Samuel Pepys. See *Great Events,* Vol. XI., p. 357.

XXXI—WAR

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT JORDAN

1. Who was the earliest historic leader famous for works of peace instead of conquest?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 92.

2. How was a general peace once established and maintained throughout the civilized world?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. XII.

3. What disrupted this?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. XVII.

4. How did the "spirit of equality" perish at Philippi?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 348.

5. How did Cæsar try to make up for the decay of Roman men?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 317.

6. How did the early Christians uphold their doctrine of peace?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 240.

7. When did the Church definitely declare for warfare and employ the sword?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 276.

8. What was the greatest of religious wars?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 62.

9. What sovereign next to Napoleon did most to destroy France by destroying her stronger men?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. XIV.

10. What was probably the most awful holocaust in the world?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 402.

XXXI

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "WAR," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXXI Page

2. The character and wisdom of Franklin may be gathered from Bigelow's *Complete Works of Benjamin Franklin*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 130.

3. The founding of Philadelphia by the Quakers and the adoption of its name are described by G. E. Ellis in his *William Penn*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XII., p. 153.

7. The tale of the early Roman republic and its mighty men has been often told. The Roman, Livy, is our best early authority in his *History of Rome*. See *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 224.

8. The change in Rome from the "spirit of freedom" to that of domination is recognized and described by the Roman, Lucius Florus, in his *Epitome of Roman History*, or *Great Events*, Vol. II., p. 179.

9. The wickedness of Nero and the Roman aristocracy is depicted by Farrar in his *Early Days of Christianity*, or *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 134.

10. The story of Romulus Augustulus and the feebleness of the last days of Rome is told by Bury in his *History of the Later Roman Empire*, and by Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall*. See *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 364, and Vol. IV., p. 1.

16. Of the many recent histories of Napoleon consult the one quoted here, or that of Pierre Lanfrey. See *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 115.

16. The Moscow campaign is fully described by Fyffe in his *History of Modern Europe*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 231.

XXXII—ARBITRATION

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY MR. CARNEGIE

1. Into what wars was Pericles forced against his will?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 34.

2. How did Cicero, the preacher against war, become involved in its strife?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 345.

3. How did the Christian doctrine of submission shift to one of armed compulsion?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 289.

4. What was the attitude toward the early Church assumed by "Julian the Apostate"?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 333.

5. Did Luther endeavor to bring peace to man?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 1.

6. What was the extent of his success?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 93.

7. What was the Amphictyonic council of the Greeks, and what were its efforts toward arbitration?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 181.

8. How did the *Alabama* claims arise?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. 124.

9. Why was their settlement specially important in the history of Arbitration?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. 367.

10. What was the feeling of the mass of Chinamen during the Peking siege of the legations?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 324.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "ARBITRATION," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXXII Page

3. The views of Homer upon war, and the story of the Trojan war, are given in Grote's *History of Greece.* See *Great Events,* Vol. I., p. 70.

5. The story of Josephus and of the wars into which he was plunged are best told by the hero himself in his *The Jewish War,* or *Great Events,* Vol. III., p. 150.

7. Pen pictures of most of the "Fathers of the Church" may be read in A. P. Stanley's *History of the Eastern Church,* or *Great Events,* Vol. III., p. 299.

8. For the difficulties between Philip of France and John of England, and the character of Pope Innocent's interference, see *John Lackland,* by Kate Norgate, or *Great Events,* Vol. VI., p. 86.

11. The life and death of the great Swedish King are described in the *History of Gustavus Adolphus,* by Benjamin Chapman, or *Great Events,* Vol. XI., p. 174.

15. The lack of a declaration of war in the late Russo-Japanese struggle is discussed in a monograph by Charles F. Horne, or see *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 381.

18. For the peace conference at The Hague consult the monograph by Thomas Erskine Holland, or *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 282.

21. The Boer war and its disasters are officially detailed by Sir A. Conan Doyle in *The Great Boer War,* or *Great Events,* Vol. XIX., p. 296.

XXXIII—HISTORY

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT HAZARD

1. Who was the Father of Historians?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 354.

2. In what earlier forms were the records of man preserved?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. XXII.

3. When did history begin to moralize?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 68; Vol. III., p. 1.

4. Why is the period of the Reformation usually treated as the beginning of modern history?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. XIII.

5. In what relation does American history stand to that of the world at large?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. XXIV; Vol. XIV., p. XIV.

6. What was the character of the men who wrote our own early histories?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 93.

7. What was the earliest account of the British colonies in America?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. X., p. 211.

8. What were the main events in the establishment of the Spanish-American colonies?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., pp. 72, 156, 254, 277; Vol. X., p. 70.

9. In the founding of the French settlements?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. X., p. 366; Vol. XI., p. 232; Vol. XII., pp. 108, 248, and 297.

10. Why has Charles Stuart been made the subject of so many Scottish songs?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIII., p. 117.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "HISTORY," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXXIII Page	
2.	The character of Sir Philip Sydney is portrayed by W. R. Cleveland in his monograph on *The Reign of Elizabeth*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. X., p. 8.
2.	For the vigorous quality of Macaulay's style consult any of his works, or *Great Events*, Vol. XI., pp. 223 and 311.
4.	The splendid stories of Swiss heroism are preserved in *The Model Republic*, by F. Grenfell Baker, or see *Great Events*, Vol. VII., pp. 28 and 238.
4.	The Scotch struggle for liberty under Sir William Wallace is described in the *History of Scotland* by Sir Walter Scott. See *Great Events*, Vol. VI., p. 369.
5.	The later struggle which culminated at Bannockburn is detailed by Andrew Lang in *A History of Scotland*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 41.
6.	For the tragic tale of the plundering of Poland see James Fletcher's *History of Poland*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 313.
6.	The final downfall of Poland is also described by Sir A. Alison in his *History of Europe*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 330.
7.	The most noted of the histories of Motley is his *Rise of the Dutch Republic*. See *Great Events*, Vol. X., p. 202.

XXXIV—THE POWER OF RELIGION

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PROFESSOR BALDWIN

1. What was the earliest known form of religion?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. xxv.

2. How did it assert its power over the ancient world?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 14.

3. What was the first proselyting faith?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. xv.

4. What faith has owed its spread chiefly to the sword?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. xvii et seq.

5. How did religion lessen the fall of the Roman civilization?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 17.

6. How did the Roman Pope gain political rule over Rome and the surrounding territory?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 332.

7. When did religion assume official control of the state affairs of Europe?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 231.

8. When did it cease to be the foremost question in statecraft?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. xiii.

9. Why is the peace of Westphalia accepted as ending the great religious wars?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 285.

10. What was the last sectarian war fought directly in the name of the Christian faith?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., p. 316.

XXXIV

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE POWER OF RELIGION," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXXIV Page

3. The beginnings of modern government in America are detailed by Charles Campbell in his *History of Virginia*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 76.

3. Its beginnings in France are well summarized by William Hazlitt in his *Life of Napoleon*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 212.

5. A full account of the Holy Alliance and its downfall is given by C. E. Maurice in his *Revolutionary Movements of 1848–49*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 1.

13. The unity of spirit that pervaded Europe in the Middle Ages is pointed out in the *History of Latin Christianity*, by H. H. Milman, or *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 201.

15. The racial spirit kept alive in Greece by the church during the centuries of subjection is described by Finlay in his *History of Greece*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. VIII., p. 55.

18. The enforced union of Ireland with England and the accompanying religious difficulties are narrated by William O'Connor Morris in his *Ireland*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 1.

18. The beginnings of the religious breach between Rome and the French Church are detailed by René Rohrbacher in his *Histoire universelle de l'Église Catholique*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 378.

20. The colonial policy of France in the Far East is discussed by Sir Robert Douglas in his *Europe and the Far East*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 120.

28. The career of England in Egypt is fully reviewed by J. F. Bright in his *History of England*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 86.

XXXV—CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY COMMISSIONER HARRIS

1. What is the origin of human society?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. XXI.

2. What has been the extremest form of "paternal" legislation?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 119.

3. What was the position of Egypt in the history of religion?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 2.

4. Where occurred the earliest known development of ancestor worship?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 270.

5. When did the spirit of love become the dominant note of religion?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 160.

6. What new ideas did Christianity add to man's religious thought?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. XV.

7. When was the first authoritative decision established setting bounds and laws to the Christian faith?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 299.

8. What addition to the body of Christian faith was made by St. Bernard?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 340.

9. What was the real nature of the addition made by the Reformation?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. XIII.

10. What was the counter-Reformation within the Catholic Church?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 293.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XXXV Page

3. The influence of Voltaire upon Christianity is discussed by John Morley in his *Voltaire*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 144.

4. A vivid account of the Reign of Terror may be found in Guizot's *Popular History of France*. See *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 311.

5. The early struggles of polygamy to establish itself in the United States are detailed by T. L. Kane in *The Mormons*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XVII., p. 94.

7. The strife between Islamism and the holders of the Brahmanic faiths of India is described by Alexander Dow in his *History of Hindustan*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 151.

8. The incidents of Mahomet's early career are given by Washington Irving in *Mahomet and His Successors*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. IV., p. 198.

11. The early Israelite attitude toward religious faith is shown in H. H. Milman's *History of the Jews*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 92.

13. The story of St. Dominic and of his missionary labors leading to the enforcement of the Inquisition is told by W. H. Rule in his *History of the Inquisition*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. VIII., p. 166.

13. The Catholic view of these same events is given by J. Balmes in his *European Civilization*, or in *Great Events*. Vol. VIII., p. 182.

XXXVI—THE MYSTERIES

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENT BARRETT

1. Has the Christian Church in the past accepted the teachings of those who would bring science to its aid?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 285; Vol. XI., p. 184.
2. What has been its attitude toward seers of visions, ghosts, and similar experiences?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., pp. 251 and 292; Vol. IV., p. 128.
3. To what extent have these "manifestations" been accepted by other faiths?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., pp. 94, 162, and 273; Vol. III., p. 247.
4. What great religious order had its foundation in a vision?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., p. 261.
5. To what extent were the apostles of Christ affected by visions?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., pp. 42 and 46.
6. What amount of faith had the ancient Hebrews in their prophets?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 160.
7. What marked examples can we find in ancient history of that sympathy between a man and his age of which President Barrett speaks?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., pp. XVI and XXI.
8. What in later history?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VI., p. XIV; Vol. VII., p. 2; Vol. VIII., p. 134.
9. What mighty visions stand at the basis of the Buddhist faith?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 164.
10. Of the Mahometan?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 234.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE MYSTERIES," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture	Page	
XXXVI		
	3.	The "assault on the outworks of religion" as it was begun in Scotland is described by P. H. Brown in his *History of Scotland*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. X., p. 21.
	3.	The assault as begun in France is described by A. M. Fairbairn in his *Calvin and the Reformed Church*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 176.
	3.	The strong inherent tendency of man to be influenced by authority in matters of faith is illustrated in *Lectures on Mediæval Church History*, by R. C. Trench, or see *Great Events*, Vol. VII., pp. 284 and 294.
	4.	The wholly inexplicable character of some of the appearances which led the mediæval ages to reject the conclusions of far-sighted seekers after truth is emphasized in the letters of Columbus. See *Great Events*, Vol. VIII., p. 224.
	8.	The story of the discovery of the mystic force of gravitation is told by Sir David Brewster in his *Life of Sir Isaac Newton*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XII., p. 51.
	11.	A remarkable example of the laws of attraction and their scientific study occurred in the discovery of Neptune. See Sir Oliver Lodge's *Pioneers of Science*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVII., p. 25.
	15.	The similar fear which retarded the introduction of vaccination is described by Sir T. Pettigrew in his *Medical Portrait Gallery*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 363.

XXXVII—HYPNOTISM

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY DR. HAYS

1. What are the earliest historical evidences of the undue power of one mind upon another?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., pp. 4 and 9.

2. What is the most recent work written with faith in "witchcraft" as opposed to "suggestion"?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 200.

3. What mystic ceremonies have long been practised by the Brahmins of India?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 65.

4. What mystic results were attained among the Hebrews?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 100; Vol. III., p. 73.

5. Should hypnosis be considered as explaining any of the phenomena in the early Christian Church?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 254.

6. What hypnotic frenzy was well recognized among the Greeks?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 191.

7. By what appeals to superstition did Attila control his Hunnish hordes?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 79.

8. What remarkable sympathetic or hypnotic disease spread through Europe in the Middle Ages?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 188.

9. What more recent manifestations have been seen of similar character?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 187.

10. What were the views and the method of Paracelsus upon these hypnotic cases?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., p. 198

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "HYPNOTISM," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture	Page	
XXXVII	3.	The history of the Greek Church and its separation from the Roman is told by H. F. Tozer in his *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 189.
	3.	Some account of the hypnotic effects noted in mediæval days is given by J. F. Hecker in his *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. VII., p. 187.
	7.	Most celebrated of the sarcastic plays directed against the medical profession are those of Molière described by H. Van Laun in his *History of French Literature*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XI., p. 347.
	17.	An account of Henry Clay's remarkable services and speeches is given in the monograph on the *Missouri Compromise*, by J. A. Woodburn, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 14.
	23.	For the signs and evidences of suffering attested by saints of mediæval days see Villari's *History of Girolamo Savonarola*, or *Great Events*, Vol. VIII., p. 265.
	23.	The impressions made upon Loyola by his sorrows are described by I. Taylor in his *Loyola and Jesuitism*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 261.

XXXVIII—THE WILL

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY M. FINOT

1. What ancient ruler was specially noted for his strength of will?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 313.

2. Through what trials of the will did Gautama Buddha pass before discovering his faith?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 163.

3. Through what intensest trial of will did Jesus pass triumphant?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 23.

4. What firm power of will was displayed by Socrates?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 106.

5. What evidence did the Romans give that the entire race were strong of will?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. 187 et seq.

6. What masses of men proved their devotion in opposition to the Romans?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., pp. 222, 231, and 246.

7. How did Charlemagne face the approach of age?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 368.

8. What great English king persisted despite almost superhuman obstacles?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. 49.

9. When has an entire modern nation bid defiance to suffering?

   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. X., p. 145.

10. What one man, unaided, by sheer will power revolutionized a nation?

    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XII., p. 223.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE WILL," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

Lecture	See Page	
XXXVIII		
	2.	A good account of the Empress Josephine is given by William Hazlitt in his *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 76.
	2.	The legends of ancient Rome are detailed and discussed by Niebuhr in his *History of Rome*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 116.
	4.	Homer's tales of Troy are given in condensed form by Grote in his *History of Greece*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 70.
	7.	The character of the Mexican civilization is described by Prescott in his *History of the Conquest of Mexico*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 72.
	7.	The Egyptian civilization is portrayed in G. C. C. Maspero's *Birth of Civilization*, or *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 1.
	7.	For the career of Thiers consult Lamartine's *History of the Restoration of Monarchy in France* and Guizot's *History of France*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVI., p. 207, and Vol. XVII., p. 137.
	7.	For the career of Macmahon consult Von Moltke's *Franco-German War* and Hanotaux's *Contemporary France*, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 302 and 351.
	15.	The tragic tale of France's shame at Panama was outlined by Senator Depew in a speech in Congress, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 360.

XXXIX—THE HOPE

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY SIR HENRY THOMPSON

1. What seems to have been the earliest impression acquired by man as to the powers outside himself?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. XXIII et seq.

2. What ancient people showed themselves most dissatisfied with the human life around them?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. I., p. 165.

3. What people were most happy to live their lives on earth, and ignored the Beyond?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. II., p. XIII.

4. In what lay the peculiar power of Christianity's appeal to a future life?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 70 et seq.

5. How did this come to be emphasized by the apostles?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. III., p. 52.

6. What influence had the idea of a future life upon the Mahometans?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IV., p. 247.

7. At what period did the belief and planning for a future life lead men almost wholly to ignore the present one?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VII., pp. 18 and 22.

8. When did they become rearoused to the joy and worth of our present existence?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VIII., p. 134 et seq.

9. How did the joy of life invade the Catholic Church, and with what unfortunate results?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VIII., p. XXIII.

10. How did it ally itself to the forces of the Reformation?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. IX., pp. 128 and 137.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "THE HOPE," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

Lecture	See Page
XXXIX	

5. For the anthropomorphic conceptions of their gods by the early races see Hammurabi's *Law Code*, or *Great Events*, Vol. I., p. 14.

6. The condition of Jewish ceremonial in religion at the time of Christ is described by Renan in his *The Apostles*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 40.

6. The formation of the Eastern Church and growth of its doctrines are detailed by J. L. Mosheim in his *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. III., p. 299.

6. The spread of this Eastern Church through Russia is described in *A History of the Church of Russia*, by André Mouravieff, or in *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 128.

7. The progress of the Roman Papacy to the leadership of Europe is depicted by A. R. Pennington in *The Church in Italy*, or *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 231.

7. The circumstances of the establishment of the Anglican Church in England are given by John Richard Green in his *History of the English People*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. IX., p. 203.

9. The character of the Koran is illustrated in Simon Ockley's *History of the Saracens*, or see *Great Events*, Vol. IV., p. 198.

9. The brightest flowering and the decay of the Mahometan power are depicted by S. A. Dunham in his *History of Spain and Portugal*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. V., p. 256.

XL—OUR GOAL

QUESTIONS

LEADING TO A COURSE OF COLLATERAL READING ON THE THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PRESIDENTS ALDERMAN AND HARRIS

1. Where did the growth of the modern "citizen" begin?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. V., p. XXIII.
2. When did the merchant or middle class become the leaders in modern life?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVII., p. XIII et seq.
3. What were the principles which Washington proclaimed in his Wall Street address and also in his Farewell?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIV., p. 197.
4. In what other land has republicanism also been accepted as "the final form of human society"?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. VIII., p. 336.
5. What did patriotism mean to the soldiers of Grant and Lee?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVIII., pp. 26, 46, 77, and 110.
6. In what sense is education the cornerstone of democracy?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIV., p. XIII.
7. Whence has sprung the education of to-day?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XI., p. 192.
8. By what world-benefiting deeds have Americans won glory for their country in the last seventy years?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVII., pp. 1 and 265; Vol. XVIII., pp. 175 and 287.
9. What is the most recent evidence of the increasing strength of republican government and the growing faith in universal brotherhood?
   See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XIX., p. 352.
10. What other voluntary federations has the past century witnessed?
    See GREAT EVENTS, Vol. XVII., p. 334; Vol. XVIII, pp. 196 and 340.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION

FOR STANDARD ACCOUNTS OF SUBJECTS BROUGHT UNDER DISCUSSION IN "OUR GOAL," SEE AS FOLLOWS:

See Lecture XL Page

4. The strong faith of the "fathers" in republicanism is shown by their labors on our Constitution as described by Story in his *Commentaries*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 173.

4. For the victory with which Washington closed the Revolution see Dawson's *Battles of the United States* and Lord Cornwallis's *Correspondence*. or *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 97.

6. The spirit of patriotism which stirred our ancestors may be read in the *Works* of John Adams, or of Franklin, Jay, and Laurens, or see *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 137.

6. The spirit of patriotism shown by the Russian peasantry, even in their late disastrous war, may be gathered from the account of *The Russo-Japanese War*, by C. F. Horne. See *Great Events*, Vol. XIX., p. 381.

7. The enormous development of America's industries is illustrated by C. W. Dabney's monograph on *The Cotton Plant*. See *Great Events*, Vol. XIV., p. 271.

9. The spreading interest in education undoubtedly begins with Pestalozzi's work. See the monograph on *Pestalozzi* by G. Ripley, or *Great Events*, Vol. XIII., p. 364.

10. The principles of American democracy as laid down by its chief exponent, Jefferson, are given in his *Works*, or in *Great Events*, Vol. XV., p. 18.

10. The contrast between these doctrines and Socialism may be gathered from Thomas Kirkup's *History of Socialism*, or *Great Events*, Vol. XVIII., p. 141.

Date Due

E 168 .H78 v.2
Horne, Charles Francis, 1
The meaning of modern life as
010101 000
0 1163 0199320 4
TRENT UNIVERSITY

E168 .H78 v. 2
Horne, Charles Francis,
1870-1942, ed.
The meaning of modern life
as sought for and interpreted
in a series of lectures and
addresses...
366871

DATE | ISSUED TO

366871